

**The Ramakrishna Mission
Institute of Culture Library**

Presented by

Dr. Baridbaran Mukerji

RMICL-8

6

4677

“ For God, Crown and Country ”

GANDHISM
CUM NON-CO-OPERATION
EXPOSED

By
ARGUS



PUBLISHED BY
SHIVA PROSAD BARUAH, M.L.C. (Assam)

PRINTED BY
THACKER, SPINK & CO
CALCUTTA

4677 ✓

902

904 Re .

ERRATA.

Page vi, line 28, *for* " mence " *read* " menace."

Page 17, 1st line, *for* " tacle " *read* " spectacle."

Page 46, 3rd line, *for* " suitation " *read* " situation."

Page 52, delete line 4, and *add* " however so far dared to advise people that if they," *after* line six.

Page 57, line 19, *for* " numerbeless " *read* " numberless."

Page 71, line 22, *for* " tartal " *read* " bartal."

Page 73, line 6 from bottom, *for* " experinece " *read* " experience."

Page 85, line 10 from bottom, *for* " Kalidts " *read* " Kalidas."

Page 105, line 22, *for* " resentment " *read* " resentment."

Page 119, line 2 from bottom, *for* " any " *read* " and "

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	v
CHAPTER I.—Non-co-operation and Swaraj	1
CHAPTER II.—How Swaraj is to be attained? Strategy of the Non-co-operation War	16
CHAPTER III.—Non-co-operation <i>versus</i> Co-operation (Differences in principles and methods)	31
CHAPTER IV.—Non-co-operation and the <i>Charka</i> Gospel	35
CHAPTER V.—Non-co-operation and the Temperance Movement	42
CHAPTER VI.—Non-co-operation and the Problem of Education	46
CHAPTER VII.—Gandhian Non-co-operators and their attitude towards Panchayets and Law Courts	50
CHAPTER VIII.—Non-co-operation and the Problem of Caste and Untouchability	58
CHAPTER IX.—Non-co-operation and the tampering with the Masses	64
CHAPTER X.—Non-co-operation and the Strikes and <i>Hartals</i>	71
CHAPTER XI.—Non-co-operation and the Punjab Affairs	87
CHAPTER XII.—Non-co-operation and the attitude towards Turkish and the Khilafat Questions	90
CHAPTER XIII.—Problems of National Defence and the Non-co-operation Mentality	100
CHAPTER XIV.—Non-co-operation and Bolshevism	103
CHAPTER XV.—Non-co-operation and the Afghan Muddle	106
CHAPTER XVI.—Non-co-operation and the Ali Brothers' Creed	116
CHAPTER XVII.—Non-co-operation and the Hindu-Muslim Unity	123
CHAPTER XVIII.—Government Policy and the Duty of Citizens	127
CHAPTER XIX.—Gandhian Non-co-operation in actual performance. (Doctrine of "soul force" and "non-violence" in words, speeches, deeds and thoughts in actual practice by the non-co-operators)	129

	PAGE
CHAPTER XX.—Actual Results. (What has the non-co-operation movement so far achieved)	137
CHAPTER XXI.—England and India.—(Non-co-operation a direct menacé to the glorious co-operative future)	140
CHAPTER XXII.—Non-co-operation—A Doctrine of Satanic Hate	141
AFTERWORD	143
APPENDIX	145

FOREWORD.

THERE is at the present moment in Indian Politicsⁿ one question which must be absorbing the attention^{her} of all thinking men—we mean the Non-co-operation^{its} movement. We are passing through troublous^{the} times. A movement has been set on foot having^{to} as its object the subversion of the present order^{ood} and deluding the people into accepting a cult which tended to encourage them to defy established^{and} Authority. Many thoughtful men foresee^{the} the success of the propaganda, which is of a distinctly^{anti-British} character, will spell ruin and anarchy^{to} for the people of the country. Non-co-operation with the Government is sheer madness, as we are not capable of maintaining internal peace and order and defending the country from foreign aggression without the long and strong protecting arm of the British Raj. At a time when the Government has placed the people of India on the high road to Responsible Government, when a very large share has been given to the people in administering their own affairs, it is the height of folly and ingratitude on the part of the people to take to boycotting British rule to which India is greatly indebted for peace and prosperity. A moment's reflection ought to suffice to convince every level-headed Indian that the brightest hopes of India are blended with the existence of British rule.

The whole world has lately been shaken by the Great War as it never was before, and it has profoundly and decisively affected the lives and fortunes of us all, and probably to a greater extent than any one cause which is likely to operate in our lifetime. The war has done much to shake some old convictions and to induce us to look at old problems in a new light with a greater readiness to believe that we all have much to learn, and that the happiness of the world is to be sought in due consideration for other people's

rights and interests. All this is to the good ; but with it all there is running round the world a wave of excitement and impatience which seems to make men thing that whatever is wrong, advance and happiness are to be sought in destroying all existing institutions. We need only to refer to its worst manifestations in Russia. The times are grave enough without allowing further dissipation of energy or further destruction of assets. All have to put their backs into the work if the wounds of the war are to be healed and the world restored to stable equilibrium. Peace—political, industrial, social, economic peace—is the great need after four years of frightful war. There is no time for running about luxuriating in idleness, discontents, and weakening the institutions we have, without seeing clearly how to replace them.

It therefore behoves all who have a standing and authority amongst the people to do what they can to counteract such attempts to disturb men's minds and to point out the folly and unhappiness of such black and negative conceptions as are being inculcated. It cannot be denied that the Non-co-operation movement, under which the new revolutionary propaganda is being carried on, has to a certain extent permeated the people. What with its novelty, and its appeal to the emotions and sentiment of the ignorant masses, the spread of the propaganda has become a source of grave menace to peace and order. It has therefore become more necessary that efforts should be made from all sides to counteract the movement by practical reason and by exposing the fallacies and impracticability of its doctrines.

With this object in view, the author, or rather the editor and compiler, ventures to bring out this humble work before the public. He, however, owes one word of explanation and it is this—that he does not lay any claim to originality. He has drawn inspiration from various newspaper and magazine articles and other contributions, and also from many weighty pronouncements and speeches, which appeared from time to time in print, and to all these he acknowledges his indebtedness. He has taken the

liberty to refer to them frequently and also to quote pertinent extracts from them freely, and his labours have been chiefly to weave the various disjointed facts into a connected form to serve the purpose of a Handbook for scathingly exposing some of the doctrines and professions under which the non-co-operation propaganda is actually working. So, without further apology, let this work go forth to try to perform its duty, however humble and incomplete it may be, in adding its weight to the efforts of those who are striving to stem the tide of the revolutionary flood in the interests of Peace and Order.

August, 1921.

CHAPTER I.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND SWARAJ.

Genesis.

The non-co-operation war was originally formulated and declared by the All-India Khilafat committee by way of protest against the Turkish Peace Treaty. The Khilafat Committee was formed early in 1920 and meetings were called all over India to express sympathy with Turkey. It is said that the Indian Musalmans have been compelled on conscientious grounds to adopt this **“non-violent Jihad”** in honour of Islam and in defence of the Khalifa. Mr. Gandhi made common cause with the Ali Brothers and other extremist Musalmans who had started up this violent “khilafat” agitation, and in concert with them formulated his ultimately famous four progressive steps of Non-co-operation.

Mr. Gandhi justified the adoption of non-co-operation by the Indian Muslims as the only alternative left to them to defend the Khilafat, and called upon all Hindus to make common cause with the Musalmans in this matter in order to express sympathy with them and to cement the Hindu-Muslim entente. Mr. Gandhi wrote as follows :—

“Three courses were open to the Mahomedans in order to mark their emphatic disapproval of the utter injustice to which His Majesty’s Ministers have become party, if they have not actually been the prime perpetrators of it. They are :—

- (1) To resort to violence.
- (2) To advise emigration on a wholesale scale.
- (3) Not to be a party to the injustice by ceasing to co-operate with the Government.

“There was a time when the boldest, though the most thoughtless, among the Musalmans favoured violence, and the ‘Hijrat’ (emigration) has not yet

ceased to be a battle cry. I venture to claim that I have succeeded by patient reasoning in weaning the party of violence from its ways. I confess that I did not—I did not attempt to—succeed in weaning them from violence on moral grounds, but purely on utilitarian grounds. The result, for the time being at any rate, has however been to stop violence. The school of 'Hijrat' has received a check, if it has not stopped its activity entirely. I hold that no repression could have prevented a violent eruption, if the people had not had presented to them a form of direct action involving considerable sacrifice and ensuring success if such direct action was largely taken up by the public. Non-co-operation was the only dignified and constitutional form of such direct action. For it is the right recognised from times immemorial of the subject to refuse to assist a ruler who misrules".

"At the same time I admit that non-co-operation practised by the mass of people is attended with grave risks. But in a crisis such as has overtaken the Musalmans of India, no step that is unattended with large risks can possibly bring about the desired change. Not to run some risks now will be to court much greater risks if not virtual destruction of Law and Order". Thus spoke Mr. Gandhi in June 1920.

In the course of another article, Mr. Gandhi wrote :—

"Non-co-operation as a voluntary movement can only succeed, if the feeling is genuine and strong enough to make people suffer to the utmost. If the religious sentiment of the Mahomedans is deeply hurt and if the Hindus entertain neighbourly regard towards their Muslim brethren, they will both count no costs too great for achieving the end. Non-co-operation will not only be an effective remedy but will also be an effective test of the sincerity of Muslim claim and the Hindu profession of friendship".

This was then the position during the early part of 1920 : Non-co-operation was recommended for the Indian Musalmans on religious considerations, and it was intended to be a wholly Islamic Movement

in defence of the Khilafat and the adherence of the Hindus was invited "to prove the sincerity of the Hindu profession of friendship."

Mr. Gandhi, who is now leading the non-cooperation crusade, has, during the last few months, gone through a number of changes with bewildering rapidity. Moderates all over India cheerfully accepted the Reforms as the first instalment of Progressive Swaraj, and saved the Reforms from being wrecked by the extreme irreconcilables who raised the discordant note. It may be pointed out that the Reforms went further ahead and are much more liberal than the claims put forward in the celebrated "Memorandum of the Nineteen" and also the original "Congress- League scheme". "Gandhi the Politician" was apparently a passive spectator then when the Moderates or Liberals and the Extremists or Nationalists were fighting about the adequacy or the inadequacy of the Reforms, and as to whether they should be accepted as a generous First Instalment of Responsible Government or should be absolutely thrown out as wholly unsatisfactory. The irreconcilable attitude of the Extremists who began to get more and more violent compelled the more sober and practical politicians to leave the Congress which was usurped by the extremists and to form their own separate organization, and as a result thereof almost all the old and veteran Congressmen who had made the Indian National Congress what it really was, by more than quarter of a century's laborious work and sacrifice had to hold themselves aloof from the present Congress activity. It was under this atmosphere that the Congress was held at Amritsar in the last week of December 1919. There was undoubtedly considerable tension of feeling which was accentuated by the Punjab affair of the previous summer. Be that as it may, it appeared that when Mr. Gandhi went to the Congress, he was all for Co-operation, and he actually gave notice of a resolution accepting the Reforms as the First Instalment of Swaraj and promising co-operation in reply to the King Emperor's message, but finally, he did not ultimately

press his resolution but agreed to a compromise in which while declaring the Reforms to be "unsatisfactory, inadequate and disappointing", directed the working of the Reforms with the view to obtain full self-government at an early date.

During the beginning of 1920, the attention of the whole country was focussed on the Reforms, and both Moderates and Extremists were busy delivering political lectures with the object of educating the electorates for their new and responsible duties. Many of the present day prominent non-co-operators came forward as candidates for the first elections and the election campaign was conducted on the party basis of Moderates or Liberals vs. Extremists or Nationalists. It was at this juncture that all on a sudden the whole Indian political atmosphere changed when Mr. Gandhi, in collaboration with his Mahomedan Allies, descended to the active political arena with the Non-co-operation cult by way of protest against the treatment of Turkey and the Khilafat by England and her Allies of the late world war.

A "hartal" was proposed for the 19th March 1920, and Mr. Gandhi issued a manifesto strongly urging that there should be no violence and that it should be absolutely voluntary. He suggested that if the Turkish Treaty should be unsatisfactory, "there should be no violence in thought, speech or deed, no boycott of British goods, as it is one form of violence, **and no mixing of other questions with the Khilafat**, such as the Egyptian questions". Mr. Gandhi proceeded to advise:—"Non-co-operation with the Government, free from all things of violence, is the only effective remedy open to the people. No threat of ostracism should be used and the withdrawal of co-operation should be purely voluntary". He spoke very strongly against violence:—

"I should cease to co-operate, and advise every Hindu and for that matter everyone else to cease to co-operate, the moment there was **violence actually done, advised or countenanced**. I would therefore urge upon all speakers the exercise of the greatest

restraint under the gravest provocation. There is certainty of victory, if firmness is combined with gentleness. The cause is doomed, if anger, hatred, ill-will, recklessness, and finally violence are to reign supreme. I shall resist them with my life, even if I should stand alone". This was the attitude of Mr. Gandhi in March 1920.

The 19th of March passed and a large number of meetings were held all over India in which many prominent Hindus participated. April 9th was fixed as Khilafat day, and Mr. Gandhi moved a resolution in Bombay which was passed by the meeting, declaring that if the just demands of the Musalmans were not agreed to, and in the event of any adverse decision being arrived at "it will be the duty of every Indian to withdraw co-operation from Government until pledges are fulfilled and Muslim sentiment conciliated".

The great Khilafat demonstration in Madras was held on April 17, and Mr. Gandhi's famous four progressive steps in Non-co-operation were passed as a resolution :

"In consonance with the spirit of the resolution adopted by the All-India Khilafat committee, this conference, in the event of the present agitation proving futile and ineffective, calls upon all Indians to resort to progressive abstention from co-operation with government in the following manner :—

Firstly, to renounce all honorary posts, titles and membership of Legislative Councils.

Secondly, to give up all remuneratory posts under Government service.

Thirdly, to give up all appointments in the Police and Military forces.

Fourthly, to refuse to pay taxes to Government".

It will be remembered that Mr. Gandhi in March 1920 had forbidden the mixing up of other questions with the Khilafat, and directed that the Non-co-operation war should be concentrated to that one issue : but it was found that Khilafat alone was not sufficiently attractive to the bulk of the Hindus, and

so, at the meeting of the All-India Congress committee at Benares, on May 30 and 31, the Punjab "atrocities" and the "deficiencies of the Reform Act" were added as further provocative causes, and it was decided to refer the question to the "country" in a meeting of the Special session of the Congress to be convened in September.

Mr. Gandhi has however the supreme quality of being most unconstitutional and to do everything in his own way in the most autocratic fashion. He did not wait till the Special session of the Congress to see what view the "representatives of the people" would take of the matter, but forthwith started a vigorous agitation in order to thrust his Non-co-operation cult on his countrymen. An ultimatum was sent to the Viceroy, giving him a month's grace to surrender unconditionally to Mr. Gandhi's demands, and August 1 was proclaimed as the day on which the non-co-operation campaign was definitely to begin. Mr. Gandhi, however, started his campaign in anticipation from the beginning of July without waiting to see the response of the Viceroy and the people of India, and the non-co-operation war was thus definitely launched from 1st July 1920 on Mr. Gandhi's sole responsibility. Mr. Gandhi took up a very peculiar position in the whole matter. He declared that in the event of the Majority in the Special Congress deciding against him, he would regard himself entirely free to go on with his programme irrespective of the Congress resolution.

On September 4, 1920, the special congress began at Calcutta, and after long discussion, a resolution was formulated approving Mr. Gandhi's progressive non-co-operation policy. Over 3,000 delegates abstained from voting, 1,826 voted with Mr. Gandhi, 884 for Mr. Pal's amendment, and 63 objected to both or were neutral. Thus it is that with the support of 1,826 self-elected representatives out of the total of about 5,800 delegates who attended the congress, the whole country was committed to the insane folly of Mr. Gandhi.

Although the original objective of the non-

co-operation war was to put pressure on the Imperial British Government through the Government of India with the view of securing better peace terms for Turkey consistent with Indian Musalmans' sentiments and demands, it has been subsequently transformed as the weapon for fighting the "Bureaucracy" to secure **full Swaraj at once or within one year**, and both the Khilafat and the Punjab "grievances" became wholly subordinate and secondary to it. A demand had been made for full Swaraj at once—and Mr. Gandhi, the Ali Brothers and their other lieutenants declared that the Khilafat and the Punjab "wrongs" could only be righted by the granting of full Swaraj to India and not otherwise.

Since the acceptance of the Gandhi-cult by the Special Calcutta Congress, and its acceptance and endorsement by the Nagpur session of the Congress in December 1920, the non-co-operation leaders and their followers have been carrying on a violent propaganda which has the result of introducing much disorder in the country and acrimony between the different political parties and has contributed to the preaching of an active gospel of hate against the constituted Government and authorities. It has therefore become necessary to discuss the aims, objects, mentality, professions and performances of the supporters of the non-co-operation movement with the view of examining whether they will be successful in the direct object of their propaganda on which their teachings and energies have been concentrated.

Means and end.

What is the avowed object of the non-co-operation war? The immediate objective of the campaign has been to establish Swaraj in India within one year, which would expire with the 4th of September, 1921. Non-co-operation is therefore the "means" and Swaraj the "end" of this campaign. Everybody would have been satisfied if the strategy which the non-co-operators intended to adopt had been put thus explicitly. But on this point too, we find interpretations and cross-interpretations which lead to

confusion, not only between means and end, but also about the real object or goal. We find it asserted by Mr. Gandhi that he has ventured to offer to India Non-co-operation as a remedy for her many ills. He went on to add—"Whether she will really respond or not remains to be seen. If it has been taken up purely from revengeful motives, it will fail. If it has been taken up, as I believe it has been, for the purpose of self-purification and self-sacrifice, it is bound to succeed."

"Non-co-operation is therefore a process for self-purification and self-sacrifice : this is not a weapon for fighting the Bureaucracy for obtaining Swaraj ; it is purely a spiritual weapon for "self-realisation". Mr. C. R. Das declared that Swaraj means that India should be self-contained and self-efficient. If that be so, then a political warfare with the Bureaucracy is wholly unnecessary. Gandhi, on several occasions, used "Swaraj" and "Self-realisation" as synonymous terms. Again, on other occasions we are told that self-realisation is a step towards Swaraj. On the other hand, Mr. Ashini Kumar Dutta, a prominent Bengalee Nationalist with spiritual proclivities, asserted that "establishment of Swaraj was only a step towards self-realisation". We have therefore three different standpoints of the ends and the correlation of the means thereto, viz., (1) Swaraj is self-realisation ; (2) Swaraj is only a step towards self-realisation ; and (3) self-realisation and self-realisation alone can lead to Swaraj.

In order, therefore, to judge the ways and means of the movement, we must try to understand more clearly, what according to the exponents of the cult, are intended to be conveyed by the catch-words "non-co-operation" and "Swaraj".

What is non-co-operation?

The difficulty of dealing with non-co-operation lies in its chameleon-like variety, the different meanings given to its objects by different leaders, and the non-aptitude of its means for the attainment of its proposed ends. As Mrs. Annie Besant rightly

put it—"Like the many-headed hydra which Hercules set out to slay, as any head is cut off by the sword of reason and common sense, another head at once replaces the one destroyed".

The demand on the part of those who have come to be known as non-co-operators is that co-operation between the people and government should cease. In its direct implication, "non-co-operation" therefore means nothing but the isolation of the present government by holding oneself aloof from it—"hands off" as some of the extremists declare. This is however wholly a negative conception—aimed at paralysing the existing institutions by refusing co-operation with them. The bare catch-word "non-co-operation" does not by itself indicate any constructive line of work. In its essence, the idea of non-co-operation is political asceticism. The difference, however, between spiritual asceticism and this new cult of political asceticism is that the former wants nothing but gives up everything, whereas the latter is assertive in its character and that under the garb of **Sannyasha** or asceticism it aims at political aggrandisement. Because there is this inconsistency between the real basic idea of non-co-operation and its actual practice, we find ingenious attempts to explain the significance of the non-co-operation movement.

Non-co-operation had been defined by Mr. Gandhi "as a kind of antiseptic treatment intended to cleanse the people of dirt". Mr. Gandhi said on another occasion—"Non-co-operation is a religious movement designed to purge Indian political life of corruption, deceit, terrorism, and the incubus of the white superiority". One of the grounds urged by Mr. Gandhi for refusing co-operation with the present government is that "we are violent when we sustain a government whose creed is violence".

The movement is intended, we are told, to paralyse the government, to bring the government to its knees, and it is justified as a "war against the government", a non-violent war, hitherto unknown, but put forward as supremely effective.

A prominent Bengal leader said that they wanted Swaraj or absolute independence—they had declared a war of Independence, but it must be a peaceful war without violence or bloodshed.

The discussion on non-co-operation therefore leads up to this position that it is a “non-violent war of independence waged for extorting Swaraj from the hands of the unwilling bureaucratic government”.

What “Swaraj” is aimed at?

One may fairly ask, perhaps, what part this war plays in gaining Swaraj? Unhappily, we cannot find out what Swaraj is really wanted.

In his booklet “Home Rule for India or Hind Swaraj”, Mr. Gandhi’s Swaraj was an inner freedom—it was a psychological state of the individual. The enjoyment of this inner independence cannot be interfered with by the accident of an outer domination by a foreign power. Mr. Gandhi had condemned the parliamentary form of government in the strongest possible language, and his remarks on the “Mother of Parliaments” were not at all complimentary. It however so happened that after Mr. Gandhi came to take a prominent part in congress politics, from which he had hitherto been holding himself aloof, he was compelled to revise his view and by a subtlety of reasoning, he attempted to differentiate between his individual work and corporate activity. Writing in *Young India* of the 26th January, 1921, Mr. Gandhi stated :—

“But I would warn the reader against thinking that I am to-day aiming at the Swaraj described therein. I know that India is not ripe for it. It may seem an impertinence to say so. But such is my conviction. I am individually working for the self-rule pictured therein. But to-day my corporate activity is undoubtedly devoted to the attainment of Parliamentary Swaraj in accordance with the wishes of the people of India”.

We may well contrast this somersault of Mr. Gandhi with that of Mr. C. R. Das who was till lately a zealous exponent of "Democratic National Autonomy". While Gandhi now advocates "parliamentary government", Mr. Das speaks of Swaraj as an **inner consciousness**.

Addressing the Bezwada Conference on the 31st March, Mr. Das said :—

"I have many times been asked to define Swaraj. It did not mean any particular system of government which the congress might argue about or settle. Swaraj was the right of the people to determine their own affairs and their own form of government. It was the freedom so to determine that constituted Swaraj. It was futile to discuss any particular forms of Swaraj".

Again, addressing a meeting in Calcutta a few days after, Mr. Das said :—

"What is Swaraj? What are we engaged in this war for? To attain Swaraj. Is it a system of government? I say, No! He who really feels the pangs of slave mentality in him, he who really feels that he is penitent over it, will attain Swaraj or will find that the way to Swaraj is nearer. They must concentrate their whole-hearted attention to win it. If this spirit is not awakened in them they will get no way to attain Swaraj. In my opinion death is preferable to slavery. It is not any policy or a scheme, neither does it depend upon the decision of a Parliament. Anybody can give Swaraj. If it is so anybody can take it too. Resolve to free yourself and the only weapon to do so is non-co-operation. We won't use any violence, but we must keep ourselves aloof".

This hedging on the real issue did not satisfy a large number of extremists who wanted to have more light thrown on the form of Swaraj which is to be established to supplant the present government. A demand for an outline of "Democratic Swaraj" was met with the following rebuff from Mr. Das—"What

is democratic swaraj? Swaraj is Swaraj, why should you limit or define it, by saying that it is democratic? Swaraj may be democratic. It may be autocratic. It may be monarchical. It may be republican". The insistence of Mr. B. C. Pal and his followers that a scheme for Swaraj must be prepared and placed before the public led to a split in the Bengal Provincial Conference at Barisal in March 1921, and Mr. C. R. Das strongly criticised Mr. Pal for demanding a scheme of Swaraj and asserted that it was not necessary to determine now what kind of Swaraj India is to have. The matter had therefore to be again shelved to the annoyance of a considerable section of the sober and practical politicians. Even such an extremist Journal as the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* was compelled to declare "unless such a determination is arrived at beforehand, there is bound to be serious trouble and anarchy if the present Raj should come to an end".

For the time being, therefore, Mr. C. R. Das carried off the palm and the "social democrat" Bipin Chandra Pal was put out, with the result that Mr. Pal had to withdraw himself from active propaganda.

Following the memorable interview of Mr. Gandhi with the Viceroy and the publication of the apology of the Ali Brothers, Mr. Pal sent a long letter to the press on 2-6-21 with the heading "Mr. Gandhi and settlement by compromise". In the course of that letter Mr. Pal said :—

"But when it comes to a settlement of the great national issue before us, it will not be right or wise to allow the Mahatma to work in secret and through confidential interviews with the authorities. Here he must be guided and controlled by the open mandate of the whole country. This warning is necessary because judging from his past acts and attitudes, one would not be very wrong to presume that if he is left to himself Mr. Gandhi might be satisfied if the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are righted, and the Government of India shows signs of "repen-

tance ". I know it from an unimpeachable source that as late as November last year, Mr. Gandhi told an English friend that he would be satisfied if these wrongs were sought to be repaired. Asked—"What about Swaraj"? he said that he would leave it to the other leaders to carry on that agitation. I had no reason to disbelieve this statement ; because it is public property that in September last, during the special session of the congress in Calcutta, Mr. Gandhi had openly said that he did not set any special value upon Swaraj. Any other form of government, whether indigenous or foreign, that secured justice to the people, would be as good. Even now he puts the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs first and the demand for Swaraj next in all his public pronouncements. Swaraj is evidently like an appendix to his cause, added on to his programme by his extremist followers, and accepted by him to secure their adherence to it.

I have always held it that the attainment of Swaraj by non-violent non-co-operation is only possible through some compromise with the British Government..... "

In reply to this letter of Mr. Pal, Mr. Gandhi wrote a long article in his own organ, which was full of self-contradictions in many places. We quote below the pertinent portions therefrom:—

"Mr. Pal is quite right, when he says that if the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs are redressed I should leave it to the other leaders to carry on the agitation about Swaraj for the simple reason that when India has made her power sufficiently felt in connection with the two great questions, she can have Swaraj for the asking. Swaraj is not for me something apart from the people's power to right every wrong.....Swaraj schemes will come, only after the two obstacles to any scheme of settlement are removed. Without their removal, there is nothing for India save complete

independence. The Bengalees, who attended the Barisal Conference, resented Mr. Pal's discussion because, as I apprehend, they considered it to be premature and calculated to interfere with evolution of the proper Swaraj spirit. Mr. Pal's performance was like that of a mason trying to tackle the top-most storey before the foundation was solidly laid....."

Many of the sentiments expressed by Mr. Gandhi in this article are wholly inconsistent with his previous pronouncements and declarations. Mr. Gandhi plays on hair splitting subtlety when he speaks of **Swaraj** and **Swaraj spirit** and the means of attaining them, and he frequently confuses the means with the end, not only in respect of this question, but in the case of many others.

Addressing a largely attended public meeting at Budaun on the 2nd March, Mr. Gandhi said that they wanted Swaraj to redress the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs within eight months. In the Khilafat conference held at Broach on the 2nd and 3rd June. Mr. Gandhi, while moving a resolution, said that if the people checked their anger, they could get Swaraj next month and decide the Khilafat question. Addressing a meeting in Bombay on 11th April, Mr. Gandhi repeated his old arguments that the Government was "satanic", and said that until the Government righted the Khilafat and expressed regret for past injustices they should not co-operate with it. To crown all these, however, we have the latest pronouncement from Mr. Gandhi that he would be content with Dominion Self-Government. This he did at a meeting of the Central Parsi Association in Bombay, which he attended on invitation to meet the members of the Council and discuss the subject of Swaraj. In course of the discussion, Mr. Gandhi was asked what would be the position of their British rulers under Swaraj, and he said that he was fighting for a Parliamentary Government with control over the army, law, police, revenue, etc., and would be content with Dominion Self-Government. We may pertinently ask whether Mr. Gandhi

CHAPTER II.

HOW SWARAJ IS TO BE ATTAINED. STRATEGY OF THE NON-CO-OPERATION WAR.

MR. GANDHI, speaking at Simla on the 15th of May, said that he wanted his countrymen to understand that leaving everything aside, as long as they stood by non-violence and sacrifice for the sake of justice to their country, no power on earth could check them from the attainment of Swaraj within one year. He went on to add—"Attainment of Swaraj depended upon the spirit of the fearlessness and sacrifice, non-violence, Hindu-Muslim unity, and the use of *Charka*."

Writing so far back as in February last, Mr. Gandhi declared:—"Let not our rock be violence and devilry. Our rock must be non-violence and goodness. Let us, workers, be clear as to what we are about. Swaraj depends upon our ability to control all the forces of violence on our side. Therefore, there is no Swaraj within one year, if there is violence on the part of the people".

Then subsequently, on March 2, speaking in Budaun, Mr. Gandhi enumerated the positive conditions necessary for winning of Swaraj, *viz.*, "Non-violent Hindu-Muslim unity, the purification of body and soul, Swadeshi, collection of funds, and lastly not to be overawed by repression". However, unfortunately for us, the list given by Mr. Gandhi is by no means complete, and he has been issuing correction slips with addenda much faster than people can grasp, not to speak of assimilating them.

The entire revelation has not been given out by the Mahatma all at once, and we have here the

was serious and sincere when he made this statement. If it was Dominion Self-Government which was his objective, they why did he so long mystify the people by playing upon the word *Swaraj* without trying to make his meaning clear to those whom it might concern? The conclusion is inevitable, and it will further be borne out by Mr. Gandhi's various speeches and writings, that he is really playing a deep game, that he is using the present turmoil to foist his fads on India, and that he is making religious experiments at India's expense.

Swaraj which the non-co-operators are fighting for, is undefined and undefinable. We have so far not been favoured with a scheme or outline of what this Swaraj really is like, and this "nebulous" *Swaraj* which still exists only in the visions of the Extremist leaders has yet to take a concrete form in the realm of Idealism.

tacle of a "progressive revelation"! To the first list issued in the early stages of the campaign, we find the following condition subsequently added :— "So long as three crores of Indians remained half-starved it was impossible to gain Swaraj. The moment they accomplished the task of feeding the starving millions, they would win Swaraj". Later on again "Unless and until you eat with the *meheters* and sweepers, and come in contact with them, you will not get Swaraj". What further and fresher demands Mr. Gandhi has in store he alone knows !!!

Mr. Gandhi has, during the past few months, been imposing greater and more arduous tasks upon his followers and the country. First people were to resign their titles and distinctions, then the reformed councils were to be boycotted and every seat kept vacant, then parents were to withdraw their children from schools, then lawyers were to abandon their practice: then Manchester goods were to be boycotted, then no appeals were to be made to courts of law. These commands have not been generally obeyed, and large numbers of Mr. Gandhi's followers are placed in a position of only being his followers when it suits them. The word "hypocrite" is not too harsh when applied to them, for they do not act up to their professions. Mr. Gandhi is perfectly well aware of this fact, and he issued instructions that lawyers who had not abandoned their practice should no longer be permitted to hold office in political organisations which he controls. How far these directions have been carried out, we do not know, but obviously if similar directions are issued with regard to those who refuse to admit untouchables into their company, the whole fabric of non-co-operation will fall to the ground.

We have thus far examined the general outline of Mr. Gandhi's scheme for attaining Swaraj. Let us now study the different stages of this "non-violent war of Independence" by which Swaraj is to be established in India.

First stage of the Campaign: September 1920 to March 1921.

The first four-fold offensive launched against the "Bureaucracy" for bringing it to its knees was the issue of a mandate that students should come out from existing schools and colleges, that title-holders should relinquish their titles, that lawyers should boycott the law courts, and that the people in general should boycott the Reformed Councils, and we were then solemnly assured that Swaraj would be attained by a successful realisation of this four-fold programme. Agitation and propaganda were therefore concentrated on this programme for six months. One of the defects of Gandhi's movement is the absence of a statistical department. We have therefore been kept in the dark as to the actual performance in this respect. If however a tree is to be judged by the fruit thereof, then we must say that the output of speeches of the "army of independence" has taken the place of solid work, and that the volume of words has more than compensated for their failure to make a suitable advance towards the real objective. The Reformed Councils are in full swing and have done much useful work even in the first six months of their existence. The terrible Law Courts that fill Mr. Gandhi with scorn for British Justice remain open, more congested than ever, showing the determination of the country to keep them at full working strength. Here and there a few briefless lawyers or some who have amassed sufficient fortunes by practising in the "satanic" law courts have given up or temporarily suspended practice, but if we examine these cases critically, we should be compelled to say that in most cases the motive which actuated their action was far from being wholly unselfish. Many briefless lawyers, who were vegetating in the Bar Libraries, have by declaring their adherence to the boycott cult, not only succeeded in earning credit for "patriotism", but the allowances which they had drawn and have been drawing from the "Swaraj funds" as members of

the National Service (?) have almost in all cases exceeded their earnings or expectations in the Law Courts. Many of the capable lawyers, who temporarily went on strike, returned to practice, with the result that their incomes increased on account of the self-advertising process which they underwent as national propagandists. The bulk of the Lawyers however, perversely and tenaciously stuck to the law courts to practice the profession they were brought up to.

The immature and impulsive students, who were deluded by the agitators and came out from their schools and colleges, after making high and silly holiday, like any other students in any other country would, if they saw a pretext for getting rid of their books for a couple of weeks, have resumed their studies with appropriate expressions of repentance, and the schools and colleges are now carrying on much as usual, good sense having returned to the pupils.

As regards the relinquishment of honours, we had the necessary statistics from Government who declared that 21 title-holders out of the total of 5,000 have given up their titles. The whole non-co-operation offensive was reduced to a farce, and it was a huge failure.

We, however, find Generalissimo Gandhi and his staff expressing sincere gratification at the success(?) of the first offensive. Mr. Gandhi declared on 31st March that he "considered that the success already achieved was in every way satisfactory". Further, speaking a few days after, Mr. Gandhi declared that "the object of that campaign had been gained as they had created a sense of shame(?) in those who stuck to the Law Courts and Government Aided schools and colleges. Audacity and self-delusion can hardly proceed further.

We assert that the first stage of the campaign was unsuited to its object, that it is a dismal failure, and that naturally it has not had the smallest effect on the Government after 6 months' vogue. The ingenious attempts to create a success from a lost

cause only prove that the leaders, in order to save their face, had to give an explanation to the country, and thus while they haltingly tried to save their prestige, the programme had to be revised.

The Second stage of the Campaign: April to June 1921.)

The four-fold original programme was therefore dropped, or rather the country had been advised to give up concentration upon the old programme—as we are told that the practice of a virtue cannot be suspended at will—and a new programme (known as the Bezawada programme) was announced and launched on 1st April for the **mobilisation of men, money and munitions**: men, including women, a crore of them, paying four annas apiece and becoming members of the congress organisation: money under the name of Tilak Memorial Swarajya Fund, a crore of it, to pay for munitions, national schools and out-of-work lawyers ; munitions in the peculiar form of 20 lakhs of spinning wheels. It was asserted that the bureaucratic government would collapse on the success of this new offensive and that the hitherto “nondescript” thing styled “swaraj” would shoot forth in full bloom to redeem the Indian Nation from slavery.

Mobilisation of “men”.

Authentic figures are not yet forthcoming as to the number of people—“awakened to a living sense of their duty, their rights, and responsibilities as sons and daughters of this ancient land, firm in their loyalty to the potent principles of non-violence in thought, word and deed and under a vow not to shrink from any sacrifice and suffering which may be needed to raise the motherland by legitimate and peaceful means to a status of equality with the Self-governing Dominions of the British Commonwealth and to a place of honour among the nations of the world—who have up till now joined the Congress organisations as members through the local committees. We know in fact

that a vigorous canvassing campaign has been carried on to enlist people as members of the congress by the exercise of influences which in a large number of cases cannot be said to be wholly scrupulous and honest, with the object of completing Mr. Gandhi's "crore" of men and women. We are pessimistic enough and have yet to learn that patriotism is to be awakened by canvassing and pressure!

In an issue of *Young India* Mr. Gandhi wrote : A friend asks whether prostitutes can become members of the congress, and whether those who do not accept the creed can become members by simply paying four annas. There is certainly nothing to prevent these unfortunate sisters from becoming members if they otherwise conform to the constitution. Even thieves have a right to demand admission, on compliance with the terms of membership. One can only hope, that if the desire to join the congress is stimulated among the wrecks of society, it is a sign of coming reformation. But we may not ask such people to become members for the purpose of swelling the number. It is equally clear to me that those who will not solemnly accept and sign the congress creed, cannot become members". How far these instructions are followed by the so-called Volunteers who are enrolling members for the purpose of swelling the number at four annas a time, remains to be seen.

Munitions.

No figures are yet available about the number of *charkas* in actual use, or about the outturn from them. It will not be sufficient to distribute charkas among families to be worked only for so long as the enthusiasm last and then to be put aside after the novelty of the thing is over. It will be well if statistics of the total length of "*Spotless Khuddar*" manufactured from "*Swaraj charkas*" are maintained and published from time to time for the edification of the public.

Money : Magic of Gandhi's "crore".

On the 30th June, Mr. Gandhi declared amidst great applause that the contributions to the "Swaraj fund" exceeded the total of one crore—that a crore and five lakhs have been promised up to that date. This is undoubtedly a great achievement and we give Mr. Gandhi the credit which is his just due. We have, however, not yet received any authentic account as to the actual amount which has found its way into the Congress treasury, although we are now at the end of July. It is evident that the sum announced included amounts promised and not yet paid. But what does the money really mean? A crore of rupees, or even a quarter of this amount, if subscribed to by as many men, would represent a great power. But what is the real human value of this huge sum? Bengal has announced a contribution of 25 lakhs. But we had an announcement from Mr. C. R. Das himself that the actual collection in Bengal up to 30th June had reached only six lakhs, and that some friends of his who had already paid in their own share had offered to stand surety for several lakhs which they would try and raise, or failing to do so would pay out of their own pockets. But has any time limit been put on this? For example, S. J. Nirmal Chandra Chunder has, according to a Bengalee paper, paid 50,000 rupees and stood guarantee for another 2 lakhs and 50 thousand. We do not yet clearly know what was the state of affairs in the other provinces. But we find the *Marhatta* of Poona, the organ of the party of the late Mr. Tilak, in its issue of July 3, saying—"India has nobly responded to the call of Mahatma Gandhi to Tilak Memorial Swarajya Fund before June 30th. The collection was an uphill task but it has been accomplished by the magnificent self-sacrifice of the **Merchant Princes of Bombay and Calcutta**". But in the absence of the actual list of subscribers, it will be difficult to carry conviction to impartial people that the bulk of the Indian population has proved, by it, their preparedness to make whatever sacrifice may be needed to win Swaraj.

Gandhi's crore : how and why?

As a matter of fact, according to the scheme of collection and distribution, Mr. Gandhi through the All-India Congress Committee which he controls, will be able to handle only one-fourth of the funds collected. The remaining three-fourths are to be retained by the Provincial committees for "local needs" (?), and each province is expected to keep efficient watch over its own Finance.

As regards the object which the Swaraj Fund is intended to achieve, Mr. Gandhi wrote as follows :—

"Questions have been persistently asked as to why this large sum is required. It is a profitable investment, not for purely personal, but for public good. The amount will be devoted chiefly to distributing spinning-wheels and conducting national schools. We have, say, six crores homes, if broken down families may deserve so sweet a name. We must provide these families with spinning-wheels, and enable them to become real homes. One crore of rupees is surely the least amount required for establishing home spinning on such a basis as to become self-propagating. Similarly, if we are to reconstruct our educational system, we shall need more than one crore of rupees for the purpose."

Mrs. Naidu, speaking in Karachi on July 10, explained the five-fold purpose for which the proceeds of the Swaraj Funds would be utilised, those being :—(1) The imparting of national education which would help to grow a national spirit which the institutions working under government auspices did not : (2) stopping of liquor traffic which spelt so much misery among the masses and demoralised the people generally : (3) elevating of the depressed classes which was such a large body and whose poor status stood in the way of national growth : (4) relieving of famine-stricken people who suffered from year to year and needed assistance in addition to

what was being rendered by the Government : and (5) propagating the use of **charka** and the adoption of Swadeshi to stop the annual out-flow of wealth”.

One would have thought that after his great campaign, Mr. Gandhi would have set forth the use to which he intended to put the money, as so much for **charkas**, so much for education, and so on, and would have called upon his contributors to assist him in seeing that the utmost value was obtained. But no word has come from Gandhi on this point. What we have had from him is a demand for another effort of a gigantic kind, nothing less than the complete “boycott of all foreign made cloth by the 1st August”. “Without it”, writes Mr. Gandhi, “swaraj cannot be established or retained after it is established”. Why not? What possible connection can there be between the use of foreign cloth and Swaraj? The long and short of it is that the question of taking an account of the actual collections and expenditure already incurred in the accounts of the “swaraj funds” and the drawing up of a practical programme for utilisation of the money actually in hand, has been shelved and the people are again being led by another fascinating by-path to no one knows where.

Considerable amount of the Fund already spent : Exposure of some of the methods of Expenditure.

Mr. B. Chakrabarti, writing to the press a few months ago, raised a pertinent query about the “Swaraj Budget”. He wrote :—

“It is evident that the Congress has become a clique. The decision about the funds proves that. From now it is evident that the funds are for the up-keep of the Non-co-operation move-

ment and for nothing else. This financial settlement will drive aside all who were not in favour of this step. These clauses are an open challenge to all who are not enlisted as non-co-operators. The congress funds are not touched all at once. First they are incorporated in the Tilak Swaraja Fund, but that fund is to become the financial basis of the non-co-operation movement. Doubtless the huge Forbes Mansions will claim a heavy toll upon the fund. There is a fresh clause, which wants the care of the Committee, for the lawyers who have suspended their practice, and who are to be supported out of Seth Jamunalal Bejoy's lakh".

It has been confessed that lecturing previous to picketting proved utterly ineffective in bringing about voluntary abstinence in almost all places, and accordingly **volunteers had to be employed to picket the precincts of the excise shops.** In several places, **volunteers** are, it is said, being paid at the rate of Rs. 15 each per month to picket and keep watch.

In some provinces, particularly in Bengal, a new service has been inaugurated styled "Indian National Service", the members of which are being paid salaries which for the present do not exceed Rs. 50 per month, in addition to actual travelling allowances.

We know that in several places, **volunteers** and workers are maintained by the "Local Committees" with substantial allowances, and that these people who joined as such have not been in all cases actuated by a genuine desire to work for the country but **simply to make a living by selling their services.** We have personal knowledge that in some cases Government servants or other employees dismissed from service for gross misconduct (*e. g.*, embezzlement and similar heinous offences) are being freely employed for collection and "propaganda" work and these people who are not very scrupulous are freely scattering falsehoods and sedition against the Government. Many of the so-called volunteers and workers are not above temptation, and intelligent onlookers may well ask, what security is there for

honest accountancy with respect to the money which passes through their hands, particularly as no receipts are granted or maintained for collections on account of the "Congress Funds"?

We saw it stated in a paper that the Bengal Committee collected last year about 80 thousand rupees of which 69 thousand had already been spent, and this was before the foundation of The Indian National Service and the decision to pay its members not more than Rs. 50 a month.

On several occasions, the fact has been brought to the notice of the public of the gross extravagance which many of the committees having charge of "Swaraj funds" persistently indulged in for the organisation of demonstrations, entertainments, and other shows in honour of visits from "leaders" or on such other occasions. We have had lately the sickening exposure by Dr. Kitchlew of Amritsar, who while auditing the accounts of a "committee" detected that a sum of Rs. 103 was spent in one day for entertaining a visitor. Mr. Gandhi himself had to raise a note of warning on this point. He wrote :— "Criticism of public men is a welcome sign of public awakening. It keeps workers on the alert. Those who pay have a right to ensure economy. There is undoubtedly an extravagance often noticed about popular demonstrations, much money is spent in tinsel splendour. The expense is often thoughtless. and we are likely to gain by fearless criticism of public expenditure, of general conduct of public men". While on the question of railway travelling (the expenses of which are freely drawn from the "national funds"), Mr. Gandhi remarked :—"I must remark that there is still noticeable **a desire to avoid third class travelling.**" He went on to add—"There is no doubt that second class travelling is not within the reach of the masses, and national servants may claim no privileges not enjoyed by the latter".

An admirer and follower of Mr. Gandhi was however, compelled to draw attention in the Public Press to the waste of Public Funds. He even went so far as to charge Mr. Gandhi with occasional

extravagance, and criticised the action of Mr. Gandhi in arranging a "special train" for a visit to Mirpur Khas, and also the fact that there has been a growing tendency on Mr. Gandhi's part to travel second class. Mr. Gandhi offered an explanation as to the necessity for the special train and he further said that he was sorry to say that being no longer physically able to travel third class he was compelled to use second class compartments.

We have had lately a bombastic pronouncement from Mr. C. R. Das that the honour of Bengal must be saved at all costs, and that in order to do so, the funds of the Tilak Swaraja Bhandar would have to be made available without stint for the heroic (?) sons of Bengal who were dismissed from service for being deluded in persisting in the insane strike engineered by the East Bengal agitators.

We cannot further withhold the temptation of referring to Mr. C. R. Das' promise to "meet any further funds required from the 'Tilak swaraja fund' towards the up-keep of the National Medical College styled **Kalikata Vaidya Sastra Pith** which was opened with great *eclat* in April last in the "Forbes Mansion." If we recollect Mr. Gandhi's strange views on medicines and hospitals, and his remarks that "the present practice of medicine is the concentrated essence of **Black Magic**", then we may pertinently say that any contribution towards the National Medical College or similar institution from the Swaraj Funds will not only be immoral and dishonest, but will be contrary to the essential doctrines of the Non-co-operation cult.

We have taken the liberty to narrate these facts simply to show that it will not be possible to have "Gandhi's crore" in full for the constructive work outlined by him, and that if the different leaders in different parts of the country persist in the exercise of their autocratic will, as they have hitherto been doing, in disbursing the funds which they hold in trust, only a very small amount will actually find its way into Mr. Gandhi's treasury.

How is the huge sum already collected going to be utilised?

In any case there can be no doubt that a very large sum of money has already been collected. But how is the money going to be spent in future? Its mere existence somewhere in the custody of local treasurers in a lump-sum is of no value. Two hundred crores would be of no use if shut up in boxes. Had the money come into the hands of a sane political party, it would have been invested on profitable terms of interest or otherwise : but if the extremists invest it either in Government Securities or industrial undertakings, they will, by that very fact, lend their assistance to the very institutions they most condemn and try to undermine. The only other alternative, judging from our past experience, is to spend the money in the way that other sums seem to have already gone. Have demonstrations on a larger and larger scale, pay liberal salaries to briefless lawyers or dismissed government servants and send them out in the Mufassil to disseminate falsehoods and sedition amongst the masses, entertain the "national workers" and "volunteers" with delicious dishes in the **Swaraj Camps** and **Kutirs**, support an army of agents, engineer strikes and pay the strikers, and so on. The Assam-Bengal Railway and the Steamship strikes, backed by the Bengal Congress Committees, is an illustration of the free use of public money for political ends. A crore of rupees spent on similar undertakings could certainly cause a great turmoil, but the more the turmoil and the demonstrations, the more rapidly the money would disappear. In the end, the Government and the Law-abiding communities would remain where they were and the congress treasury would be empty.

Third stage of the Campaign: (from 1st July.)

A skilful general would have stopped to reconnoitre after the expiry of the three months which were allotted for the second campaign. We however find that Mr. Gandhi did not stop to take stock

of the ground already won, but rushed headlong to initiate a new campaign. Shall we believe that the programme for collection of "men, money and munitions" failed in its declared object of bringing the "Satanic" government to its knees, and that further it did not succeed so far as the establishment of Swaraj is concerned?

We find that further concentration on the second programme is suspended for the time being, and Generalissimo Gandhi has now opened the third stage of his campaign by ordering a complete boycott of foreign cloths before the 1st August, 1921. His latest *Ukase*, dated 1st July runs as follows :—

"What must we do now? Now our inevitable step is to bring about a complete boycott of foreign cloth. On the first of August falls the anniversary of Lokamanya Tilak's death. We can, if we work with the same zeal as we have worked for the collection, bring about an almost complete boycott on that date without which India will not have power to establish Swaraj".

The general body of the merchants and tradespeople are however not over enthusiastic. Mr. Gandhi has therefore been compelled to issue a warning that the shops will be picketted if the merchants did not within the two months allowed refrain from dealing in imported piece-goods. The merchants are however agreed on the point that Mr. Gandhi's movement will give a big impetus to local mill-made goods, the prices of which are already stiffening. Mr. Gandhi has addressed an open letter to the Mill-owners urging them to help the country by not raising the price of their goods when the demand springs up, and it remains to be seen how far Mr. Gandhi's directions will be obeyed in this respect.

We foresee the probable effects of this new offensive on commerce and the general population of the country. All that can happen, even if Manchester goods are driven out of India, is that the source of competition being removed, **Khadi** and Indian mill

made cloths will go up enormously in price, some merchants will make fortunes and get back with compound interest the "princely" donations they have made to Gandhi's Swaraj fund, others will be entirely ruined, and the unfortunate and wretched consumer will have to face yet another tax on his income!

4677.

But where is Swaraj ?

We have thus followed the different stages of Mr. Gandhi's "non-violent war of Independence". What more stages in Gandhi's strategy are still to come in the country's march towards Swaraj are unknown for the present and "General" Gandhi has not taken the people into his confidence. But the impression has come upon the people at large that Gandhi's Swaraj is like the **will-o'-the-wisp**, always evading touch and that the goal is receding further and further in proportion as Mr. Gandhi is launching fresher and newer offensives imposing impossible tasks on his blind and deluded followers.

CHAPTER III.

NON-CO-OPERATION VS. CO-OPERATION.

Differences in Principles and Methods.

What would happen if “Gandhian Swaraj” came at once?

The question of practical importance to-day is, what, in the event of the success of the present non-co-operation agitation, would be the result? Supposing that the existing system of government is brought to an end in the next few months, what form of government do the non-co-operators propose to put in its place? We do not know, for that is a matter upon which the leaders of this movement have preserved a discreet and significant silence. And until we are told we can only assume that they have nothing to put in its place except mere meaningless words. We are justified in assuming that if the existing system of government were to be brought to an end in the next few months—anarchy—the simple meaning of which is “absence of government” would prevail. Have the people ever paused to ask themselves what that would mean? How the country will be benefitted if the railways and steamers stopped running, the postal system ceased working, telegraphs give up transmitting messages, the police refrain from protecting life and property, the courts cease punishing crimes, the army refuse to offer resistance to the invader?

Non-co-operators desire Revolution :

We are afraid, though they may not admit it in clear words, that the non-co-operationists desire to make use of revolutionary methods. They wish to

destroy and they care not whether they are in a position to build up anything in the place of that which they pull down. No man who really loves his country will willingly support the adoption of such methods. The result of such methods is only too painfully obvious where they have been adopted—in Russia, for example, at the present time.

Government Policy—Evolution and the Reforms.

All real patriots will surely prefer to bring about such changes in the existing administration as they desire by the practical method of evolution. That is the method which the present Government have adopted, and the Reform Scheme initiated at the instance of Mr. Montague and Lord Chelmsford is fraught with far-reaching results. A substantial instalment of Responsible Government has been given to the people of this country, and the reforms are a long step on the road along which sober Indian patriots desire to travel. Over and above this, we have the public declaration of the Parliament of Great Britain, that it is their intention that we should proceed steadily along this road until we reach the goal of full Swaraj or autonomy.

Attitude of the Moderates.

Be it said to the credit of *bonâ fide* Indian intelligence and patriotism that the old veteran stalwarts of the congress have accepted this policy. Moderates all over India declared that Swaraj within the empire was their goal—not Swaraj disassociating them from the greatest empire in the world. It is therefore through the Reforms and by the Reforms that Swaraj within the British Empire is to be attained—not by non-co-operation nor by isolation from the government or the rest of the British Empire.

The Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, the president of the Servants of India Society (the society of genuine political **Sanyashis** founded and established by one of the greatest Indians of his time—the late Mr. Gokhale of blessed memory), whose genuine patriotism is beyond the shadow of doubt, said :—

"Moderates were blamed for speaking on behalf of the government. Could they believe for a moment that people like Sir Hormusji Wadia and Mr. Paranjpye were doing so from unworthy motives ? They were doing so because they considered it their duty to prevent the country being rushed headlong into chaos and anarchy. It was necessary to render every possible help to the government at a time when a determined attempt was being made to undermine the foundations of civil progress. Would it be proper for them to remain inactive simply because people like Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru had made up their minds to lead the country towards chaos ? They could not possibly do so in view of their sense of duty to the country and their ideas of national service. Like the non-co-operators they too were bent on achieving Swaraj at the earliest opportunity, but by their own methods which had stood the test of time. It was their duty to tell the people how their methods were better than those of their opponents and how they would lead them on to their cherished goal. It was no use blindly imitating **Sinn Fein** methods in India. They should avoid the mistakes which had cost Ireland enormous suffering and delayed Home Rule so long. The Moderates had adopted the present course of action after careful deliberation and had decided to accept partial Swaraj as a step towards the attainment of complete self-government. In several things that had recently happened, they recognised a welcome change in the British mind, which they felt it their duty to reciprocate by hearty co-operation".

Asked whether non-co-operation so far was a failure, Mr. Sastri replied—"In the first place so far as its direct aim and programme were concerned, it is a failure. The country has not declared war on the British Government and by its apparent intention to keep schools, courts and the Reformed Councils at full working strength has shown its determination not to declare war. On the

contrary it is producing the evils apprehended of it by its critics, that it would undermine order and civil harmony. If these evils, from which the people suffer more than the government, are intended by the promoters of non-co-operation, to that extent it is a success”.

As to the methods of non-co-operation, Mr. Sastri said—“As to methods we are hopelessly at variance. Our faith in the old methods which the congress knew and loved, *viz.*, constitutional agitation, remains unshaken by all that has happened. More than in the past, our future depends on ourselves. Those who have misgivings as to the further steps in the attainment of self-government are really passing adverse judgments on the electorates and their leaders, or, in other words, on the nation. It is one of the tragedies of the non-co-operation movement that this self-distrust should be so widely caught up by the young. I would ask them if they have lost faith in their fathers to cultivate some faith in themselves. If India has no future they will be to blame more than we”.

The above reflects the views of all the old veteran leaders in India who have been sustaining the Congress cause for a period of 35 years since its foundation till the Congress was usurped by an extremist clique. They all had a common goal in view—the goal of complete self-government or Swarajya. Swarajya is not the monopoly of the non-co-operator, it is also the ideal of British Government and the present reforms were the first instalment of Swarajya. The difference between the moderates and the extremists is one of method and work. Do the people want to reach this goal through anarchy and bloodshed, or by progressive constitutional reforms? The choice lies with the people at large, and with the choice goes also the responsibility for its effects. The people make the choice and the people will also reap the retribution or reward in accordance with the choice they make.

CHAPTER IV.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE "CHARKA" GOSPEL.

Genesis of the "Charka" movement.

The **charka** movement falls under the head of Swadeshi. The exact reason why the extremists laid so much emphasis on the introduction of the **charka** into every Indian household was somewhat difficult to follow at the beginning. Their general purpose, as they constantly declared, was to break the connection between India and the rest of the Empire, and they went on to add that this could be obtained by India learning to spin her own yarn and weave her own cloth. Mr. Gandhi assigns to this primitive instrument great magical virtues and powers. He asserts that it produces chastity amongst women and virility amongst men, and that if every Indian devotes so many hours of his spare time to spinning yarn, the present "Satanic" government will be obliged to go and make way for his "nebulous" Swaraj.

The **charka** movement has been given great prominence in the programme resolved upon in the Bezwada Conference of the All-India Congress Committee held on 31st March. Speaking there, Mr. Gandhi stated that he felt the **charka** movement was full of the utmost potentialities in the winning of Swaraj. Addressing the same meeting, Mr. C. R. Das said that he was one of those who did not take to the spinning wheel kindly, but he found by actual experience that the spinning wheel movement was in every way calculated to achieve their object of Swaraj. If Swaraj meant that India should be

Q—Were we then enjoying Swaraj before the British People came to India?—Author.

self-contained and self-efficient it was desirable that her people should be made to understand how this could be brought about. He considered the spinning wheel as a most simple, honest and straight proposition which could be put before the masses and taken to by them easily. Mr. Das proceeded to add that their idea in asking the people to take to the **charka** was not based upon any desire to enter into competition with foreign capitalist production, either from without or from within. Their idea was to enable the people to understand and fashion for themselves their economic life and utilise to their level best the spare time of their families and all opportunities with a view to creating more economic goods for themselves and so improve their own condition.

Speaking at Bombay, a few days after, Mr. Gandhi further spoke on the means of winning Swarajya and described the potent powers of the spinning wheel, and said that so long as three crores of Indians remained half-starved it was impossible to gain Swaraj. The moment they accomplished the task of feeding the starving millions, they would win Swaraj, and Mr. Gandhi felt absolutely confident of attaining that object by the programme launched by him. Later on Mr. Gandhi wrote:—

“The womanhood and the masses of India have been awakened as never before at the call of the spinning wheel. The masses recognise in it the giver of life. The women regard it as the protector of their chastity. Every widow I have met has recognised in the wheel a dear forgotten friend. Its restoration alone can fill the millions of hungry mouths. No industrial development schemes can solve the problem of the growing poverty of the peasantry of India, covering a vast surface 1,900 miles long and 1,500 broad. India is not a small island; it is a big continent which cannot be converted like England into an industrial country. And we must resolutely **set our face against any scheme of exploitation of the world.** Our only hope must centre upon utilising the wasted hours of the nation for

adding to the wealth of the country by converting cotton into cloth in our cottages. The spinning wheel therefore is as much a necessity of Indian life as air and water."

The economic unsoundness of the "Charka."

It has been criticised and with force that this **charka** movement will be economically unsound and that it will be suicidal for India to take to home-spinning by a boycott of manufactured yarns, imported or Indian-mill made. The Indian mills manufacture sufficient coarse yarns, and if this yarn be not exported they will more than suffice for the needs of India. If this entire outturn of yarns from the Indian mills can be woven into cloths in the looms, the problem of clothing the whole of India will be solved, and therefore concentration on the **charka** will mean the production of thread beyond the actual needs of the country. Moreover, it has been found by actual experience that the yarns manufactured by the mills can be had cheaper in the market than homespun yarn. India is dependent on Europe for the fine yarns and cloth which the Indian mills are unable to produce, much less anything the **charkas** can ever expect to produce. Mr. Gandhi has realised this position and therefore we find him declaring that "it is through coarse cloth alone that we can make India independent of foreign markets for her cloths", and he solemnly enjoins all Indians rich and poor, to take to wearing **khaddar**.

Experience of professional weavers and the Government's practical policy.

It has been found by the weavers that it is cheaper to buy the thread and weave it in the looms. Why then should people be given all this trouble and waste their time unprofitably by spinning thread with the crude **charka** when they can buy it easily and cheaply?

It is interesting to note here that the much-maligned government is much more practical in this

matter, and that the government had seriously taken the matter in hand when the noisy agitators of to-day were still in their political nursery. The yarns manufactured by the Indian mills can be had much cheaper than the yarns produced by the **charkas** and they are also less coarse. Any practical man would have therefore suggested that the sounder policy was to buy the yarn and develop the hand-loom industry. The work which the government have undertaken to teach the people improved methods of weaving stands therefore in pleasing contrast to the extremely unpractical and mischievous propaganda of the extremists in this matter.

By means of weaving experts, working under the Directors of Industries, a system of peripatetic demonstrators and advances to ex-students of the weaving institute at Serampur and elsewhere, a good deal has already been done to improve the condition of the hand-loom industry. Model charkas have also been supplied to areas in which they could not readily be manufactured, and weavers' co-operative societies have been encouraged everywhere. Government also has not been idle about the improvement of the cotton cultivation in India. It is well known that the reason why finer yarns cannot be manufactured in India is due to the fact that the class of cotton grown in India is of the short-staple variety and is therefore unfit for manufacture of fine thread. Government has taken the lead in this matter and through the Agricultural Departments of the different provinces, steps are being taken to try to introduce Egyptian and other varieties of superior cotton into India and to make them popular with the Indian growers.

Mr. Gandhi's hobby: "Charka" cult further exposed.

We have noticed how Mr. Gandhi has solemnly assured us that his magical **charka** will win Swaraj for India and accomplish the task of feeding the starving millions. He has also been good enough to oblige us with figures for the calculation of

profits so that we may not be in the dark about the great "economic possibilities" of the **charka**. Writing in his organ **Young India** he said : —

"A spinning wheel must be worked for twelve hours a day. A practised spinner can spin two tolas and a half per hour. The price that is being paid at present is on an average four annas per forty tolas or one pound of yarn, *i.e.*, one pice per hour. Each wheel should therefore give three annas per day. A strong machine cost seven rupees.....I have given enough figures to work upon."

It should be noted that these figures do not take into account the price of cotton, and so the actual outturn will be somewhat less than three annas. Mr. Gandhi may delude himself with the belief that an outturn of three annas per day after twelve hours' continual drudgery is quite satisfactory, but no labourer in India, male or female, skilled or unskilled, will accept this proposition. The economic unsoundness of this is apparent on the face of it.

Gandhi's "Charka" cult and Indian Labour Problems.

A practical politician would have abandoned the **charka** campaign long ago. But Gandhi, who is a visionary of visionaries, has not only stuck to it with all the tenacity which he can command, but has taken the gospel a bit further and has banned not only foreign stuffs but all machine-made cloths and yarns, declaring that materials produced in Bombay and Ahmedabad are accursed. He wants to wipe out by a clean sweep all established trades and industries and speaks about the destruction of machinery and mills. These industries are providing millions of people with subsistence and have largely contributed and are contributing to the solution of the bread problem of the starving millions. Mr. Gandhi has no other scheme to put forward for replacing them except the "miraculous **charka**", which will, according to his theory, solve India's

bread problem by the "princely" outturn of three annas a day. Even the poor Assam tea garden coolies, over whose sad plight the agitators created such a fuss and shed crocodile tears had, according to their own statements, been earning a far greater income than what they could ever expect by drudgery at the **charka**.

The Charka as guardian of Chastity!!! How Gandhi's twenty lakhs will be distributed.

Further, how will 20 lakhs of **charkas** do for the whole of India? They are to go to two million families, and later to another 48 million families. A family is reckoned at six persons, and every body is to spin and spin all day. How are six to spin with only one spinning wheel among them? As we are solemnly told that the spinning wheel is the guardian of the chastity of Indian women, spinning wheels should at least be provided in each family for the wife and say two daughters. But perhaps the man should also have a spinning wheel to guard his chastity, as Mr. Gandhi has advised husbands and wives to live apart, and young people to take a vow not to lead a family life till Swaraj is established, in order to prevent further slave children being born into the world!!!

A great libel on Indian Womanhood.

Mr. Gandhi in his zeal for his **charka** hobby, has dared to make a grossly libellous insinuation against the entire womanhood of India. The Indian women never required and never will require a paltry piece of dead wood to keep guard over their chastity. Their innate sense of **Dharma** is their guardian angel, and where the idea of Dharma fails, millions of **charkas** cannot take its place. The new type of men and women brought up under Mr. Gandhi's new dispensation may require a **charka** to guard their chastity, but to push this theory to include the whole of Indian womanhood is nothing but an insult to our ancient Indian Culture and the ideals of womanly virtues.

Charka cult totters.

In spite of the numerous and ingenious arguments to sustain the **charka** cult, it was found that it could not stand on the basis of sound economy or utility. A prominent Gandhian leader in Bengal has therefore been ultimately pushed to appeal to sentiment and to declare:—

“ I know nothing of the economic soundness or unsoundness of the **charka**. To me it is sufficient that the **charka** is the type of our revolt against the West. That one fact is sufficient for me. We shall take up the spinning wheel—not because it is economically sound—not because it will contribute to our material prosperity, we shall take it up because it is our own, because it accentuates the difference, the eternal and undying contrast between India and Europe.”

In Assam, where a hand-loom is indispensable in every household, rich or poor, this movement does not proclaim any new message. We want more and more yarns and cheaper too, and it will be suicidal for the Assamese to divert their attention to the unprofitable **charka** at the expense of their old familiar hand-loom.

We call upon all sane people to think twice before being deluded to befool themselves by taking up such a preposterous cult, which will neither be sound economy nor contribute in any way to lift the heavy load of poverty and misery which is weighing upon the poor. Solution must be sought elsewhere.

CHAPTER V.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT.

The avowed object of the temperance crusade is self-purification, *ie*, the purification of body and soul. The non-co-operators have however confused a purely social and spiritual matter with a passing political agitation, and instead of trying to work on *bonâ fide* lines to improve the moral and religious tone of the public mind, most of their **chelas** have resorted to picketting people at the gates of excise shops to intimidate and overawe intending customers. This method of work is neither conducive to any substantial and lasting effect, nor is it consistent with the policy of non-violence proclaimed by the leaders of the movement, as such steps must lead to collision and violence. The effect of such picketting and superficial agitation would be to make the already demoralised masses more demoralised, and would not add a single inch to the moral stature of the nation; for, being restrained from satisfying their cravings openly, people would take to secret underhand practices and the result would be an extraordinary increase in illicit fermentation and distillation, illicit cultivation and use of not only **ganja** but wild **bhang**, and illicit opium traffic, on such an immense scale that it would not be possible for the Government, not to speak of the agitators and their **chelas**, to regulate and control.

These neo-temperance reformers are inclined to forget in their zeal that the only thing that can be relied upon for abstinence is the change of mind which comes about after a long period of education and moral enlightenment. Many of them undoubtedly recognise this, but continue the propaganda with the direct object of discrediting the Govern-

ment, charging it with having encouraged the people to take to intoxicating articles with the definite object of raising revenue. Even a casual student will declare this charge to be a malicious libel wholly unworthy of the exponents of the so-called doctrine of "Soul Force". Many agitators are more honest in their outspokenness, and they admit that the direct object of this propaganda is to paralyse the Government by killing one of its principal sources of revenue. It will therefore be necessary to discuss here the Excise policy which the Government has consistently followed in handling this very intricate social problem.

It is a mistake to suppose that the Government is in favour of encouraging the use of intoxicating drugs and liquors, or that they desire to raise revenue at the expense of the sobriety of the people. The Government have always been willing to help the cause of temperance, and it is the duty of every Government to aid such a righteous cause even at the risk of loss of revenue, for any substantial loss of revenue from one source has to be met by resorting to other resources. But the Government will never be prepared to tolerate any action which may unnecessarily result in violence or contribute to friction.

Mr. Gandhi's attitude towards this problem is well worth noting, and his relation to the drink and drug habit of the Indian and Government's connection therewith, needs clearer expression. He said in one of his recent books—"It is contrary to my creed to embarrass the government or any body else. That however does not mean that certain acts of mine may not result in embarrassment." Then, with reference to the Government Excise policy, Mr. Gandhi said that this was one of the greatest injustices that the British Empire has done to India—"the traffic in intoxicating liquor and drugs for the purpose of sustaining a top-heavy administration." The accusation put into plain English would be that revenue is the sole object of the Excise Administration. The Government of India has denied this charge

indignantly more than once, and provincial Administrative Reports support the denial, because his charge is not an entirely new one. Any one who knows anything of the subject also knows that if revenue had been the only consideration, methods could have been adopted to increase the present receipts a thousand-fold.

Indian gentlemen, even those who ought to know better, often join in the slanderous accusation that the British Administration was to blame for the introduction of drinking habits into this great empire. Drinking habits go back thousands and thousands of years and no one who knows anything of the subject has a right to say that the British Administration introduced the drinking custom into this country. With regard to the consumption of liquor and drugs, the British Administration took up the position that it was part of its duty to supply the needs of the moderate drinkers and drug-takers in India and while controlling consumption, to make as much money as possible out of the control. The Government felt that it was its duty to regulate the traffic in drinks and drugs and their policy was **to get a maximum revenue from a minimum consumption.**

If we glance at the early British advent in Assam, we find that opium cultivation was then unrestrained and unrestricted. Everybody was free to cultivate and grow opium in his own **Bari**, and it is a matter of history that simply because the then Assamese nation was demoralised by opium habits, it became an easy prey to the invading Burmese hordes. The British Government took early steps to restrict opium cultivation, and there was then such a great hue and cry all over the land that in some places the peoples' protest culminated in open violence and riots in course of which an English Assistant Commissioner was killed. Government, however, stuck to its restricting policy consistent with the recognition of individual liberty of conduct of all citizens. Government fixed places and the number of shops where excisable articles could be sold, and the policy throughout was to reduce the number of shops gradually. Government

further heavily taxed all intoxicants as articles of luxury so that the price might be sufficiently high to deter ordinary people from their use. Lately, the Government has issued a resolution directing the registration of opium eaters with the object of further restrictions in the near future. The progress may be tediously slow, but it is steady, and if we recognise that evolution in itself is a very slow process, then it would be most unwise to condemn the Government because it has failed to work a miracle.

Against this orderly and systematic action, we find that the non-co-operation agitators have pitted their ideas of Excise reforms by picketting, coercion and intimidation, and they are attempting to bring about a temperance reform by a purely political agitation which the ideals and authority of religion and ethics have so far failed to achieve. It is easy to see that this agitation, instead of bringing about a lasting and permanent cure in the social body of the nation, will introduce an element of disorder and anarchy which it will be the bounden duty of the established authority to check.

CHAPTER VI.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE PROBLEM OF EDUCATION.

It is asserted by the non-co-operators that the education which the existing universities impart creates slave-mentality, and that what the situation demands is an immediate and total destruction of the system of education as it exists at the present moment and the introduction in its place of a complete system of national education. Students are exhorted to leave existing colleges and schools and are asked to join the new institutions which, it is promised, will blossom into full-fledged national universities as soon as they are brought into existence.

It would be possible for us to realise what the non-co-operation leaders exactly mean by national education if they cared to place before the public any regular scheme of education. Nothing deserving of mention, however, appears to have been attempted in this direction so far. We do not know of any systematic plan of national education beginning from primary to the highest stages. We have not before us any well-planned scheme of technical, vocational and professional studies. All that we know of is a poor and cheap replica of some parts of the existing systems. Mr. Gandhi himself beats about the bush when this problem is concerned, and his only advice for the present refers to the teaching of Hindi and the plying of the **charka**. He suggests a six-hour-a-day course in which boys will spin for four hours and be given a literary training during the remaining two hours. He proceeded to say—"The course suggested by me is intended only for this year of purification and probation. When normal times are reached and **Swaraj** is established, one hour only may be given to spinning and the rest to literary

training." Mr. Gandhi has branded Western education and Western culture as "satanic," and advises all Indians to shun them. The non-co-operation mentality is an unmitigated hate-mentality, and what they aim at is cutting down the tree of Western learning root and branch. They would banish it completely from the land. "English learning", said one of the leaders of the movement the other day, "may be good—English culture may be good—their philosophy may be good—but each one of these but help to rivet the fetters of our servitude. Therefore I say to the English, good as these things may be, take them away—beyond the seas, beyond the rivers, far off to your Western home: so that we and our generation may have nothing to do with them". Such a statement of the views of the non-co-operators has the supreme merit of unambiguity and indicates clearly what a revolution they are aiming at.

Another argument and claim put forward by the agitators is that if students leave and boycott the existing schools and colleges, they would be assisting towards the speedy attainment of **Swaraj**. We cannot understand how the establishment of **Swaraj** can be attained by depriving the students of that training so necessary for qualifying them for civic duties. A course of Hindi and **charka** will be but a sorry and poor substitute.

All patriotic Indians desire to see the whole system of education given a more specifically Indian orientation. A system that produced not Indians but imitation Europeans would stand self-condemned. We do not suggest that the existing system does that. How could we, with the object lesson before us of the number of eminent Indians which it has produced? But we confess that in the past at any rate, it may have had a tendency in that direction. The system of higher education had undoubtedly been too greatly divorced from the peculiar genius, the ancient traditions, the mode of thought and the daily lives of those whom it had sought to educate. But the question is—shall Western education be destroyed, uprooted and utterly swept away,

or shall we strive after a gradual synthesis between all that is best of the East and the West? The non-co-operators aim at an Educational revolution by sweeping away Western learning of every kind from the land. The attitude of these people discloses in the present case, as in many others, a hate-mentality. Why should India turn her back upon all that the West had to offer her by way of supplement to that which she claims as her own? Knowledge is not the monopoly of one country or one race—it is the common property of mankind; and if in certain branches of knowledge it so happens that the Western races have forged ahead of others, why should those others deprive themselves of the fruits of Western success? To do so is not patriotism—it is suicidal folly. As regards the charge of “slave mentality” we cannot do better than quote below the dignified protest made by Sir Nilratan Sarkar, the then Vice-chancellor, at the last Calcutta University Convocation:—“Among the charges levelled against our university none is more unreal, none more fantastic, than that the education that she imparts produces slave mentality in the youths of our country. No greater calumny than this has ever been uttered against those of our men and women who have received the benefits of modern education. It is neither fair nor just that an education that has conferred such lasting benefits on the people of India should be assailed in this fashion. Those who make this extraordinary suggestion betray not only a lamentable lack of knowledge of realities but also a wanton disregard of facts. A little thinking will dispel much of the misconception that exists in the minds of many persons in the matter, and a comparison of the mentality of those who have had no education with that of those who have come under the influence of education will at once show the absurdity of the proposition that the education that the university imparts has a special proneness to make people servile. It is amongst educated men that ideas of liberty and progress have mainly flourished. It is they who

have not only identified themselves with, but have been in the vanguard of, the progressive movements of the day. It is they who have attempted to remove superstitious practices and to eradicate social evils that block the way of progress and reform. It is they who have worked for the amelioration of the condition of the masses, and for removing the inequalities that disfigure the life of the community. They have always stood against oppression and wrong, have worked for the uplift of the people, and have endeavoured to secure the honour and welfare of the country, often at considerable inconvenience and sacrifice. It is they who in the main have thus worked for furthering the work of nation-building. These are not signs indicative of what our critics so fondly describe as slave mentality. Our University is to be judged by her best products, not by the indifferent ones who abound and preponderate in every university."

It will be readily admitted that the present educational system has its defects and our universities are not without their shortcomings. But what institution in the world is there which has not its imperfections, and we have our special difficulties. Those acquainted with the conditions of the most advanced among the self-governing countries in the world, where education has made the greatest strides and public interest in educational matters is so marked a feature of national life, know how great is the dissatisfaction that is often expressed by people against systems and institutions. We mention this with the object of impressing on the minds of the critics that systems and institutions grow. You cannot expect that the mere reiteration of the magic words "national education" will bring into existence one fine morning a fully equipped and faultless system of education which, like a full-grown banvan tree, spreads its branches far and near.

CHAPTER VII.

GANDHIAN NON-CO-OPERATORS AND THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS PANCHAYETS AND LAW COURTS.

Replacement of the existing law courts by a system of panchayets is one of the items of the non-co-operation programme.

Everyone will sympathise with the idea of gradual extension of the panchayet system for the settlement of disputes, and in this connection it cannot be ignored that Government have been encouraging the establishment of village panchayets everywhere. This is a matter in which the Government have actually taken the lead. There have been crude forms of village panchayets almost all over India and parties who wish to settle their disputes there have always been able to do so without let or hindrance from Government. Government too are trying to establish good panchayets in the villages for the settlement of petty disputes—civil and criminal—with statutory powers for enforcement of their decrees and judgments. There is therefore nothing new in the constructive side of the non-co-operation programme which encourages the people to have their disputes settled in the village itself and avoid going to law courts.

Real object of the Non-co-operation propaganda.

But the non-co-operation agitators have introduced political animus into this question as well, and the result is that the peaceful character of the popular panchayet movement which the Government have always encouraged and supported has become violent in the hands of these agitators. Their propaganda is aimed at organising a boycott of the law courts, and this is one of the principal destructive

items whereby they intend to paralyse the existing government, forgetting that on the existence of these institutions the healthy and peaceful everyday life of the people largely depends.

Mr. Gandhi's further doctrines and professions.

Mr. Gandhi declared—"Permanent destruction of the Law courts is a consummation devoutly to be wished for". Mr. Gandhi further said elsewhere—"Let your law courts, with their cumbersome and ruinous machinery and their alien jurisprudence, disappear, and India will set up her old panchayets, in which justice will be dispensed in accordance with her inner conscience."

Speaking at Bezwada in March last, Mr. Gandhi said that whatever the number of lawyers who had actually given up practice, the Congress had achieved the real object of the propaganda, namely the demolition of the prestige of these institutions of the Bureaucratic Government of the country. Again, speaking in Bombay on 10th April, Mr. Gandhi said that the object of the boycott campaign had been gained, as they had created a sense of shame in those who still stuck to the law courts.

Gandhi's fallacies exposed.

Bluff cannot proceed further than the above from Mr. Gandhi. We have the verdict of the country by its apparent intention to keep the courts in full working strength giving the lie to Gandhi's boast. If further evidence is necessary to expose the utter hollowness of Gandhi's boast, then it will be supplied by the Mahatmaji himself who, in an interview on the 26th April with the members of the Karachi Bar, said that the practical difficulty of so many pleaders suspending practice could be solved by drawing lots, and that those on whom the chance fell should non-co-operate while the rest should subscribe for the maintenance of the non-co-operators and their families! We fail to understand how this advice is consistent with Mr. Gandhi's doctrines that non-co-operation

is like a virtue whose practice cannot be suspended at will. Mr. Gandhi further went so far as to say that the pleaders are the parasites of the country and that the profession of the Law is the worst type of prostitution. **the profession of the Law is the worst type of prostitution.** No other puritan reformers in the world have cannot absolutely do away with the practice, then "prostitution" should be carried on by drawing lots !!!

Even in the good old days of India, of which Mr. Gandhi makes much of, there was an elaborate system for the administration of justice—civil and criminal—which was presided over by the best intellects of the country. The Ancient Scriptures and Law Books of the Hindus contain elaborate descriptions of the constitution and governance of these law courts, and therefore, the statement that the panchayets were the only institutions for the dispensation of justice in Ancient India is historically a falsehood. Only petty disputes used to be decided in the village panchayets. Big civil suits, serious criminal offences and particularly felonies, were, even in the old times, tried by the judges, and old books are full of references to such courts. It is therefore nothing but blind prejudice which seeks to extirpate the law courts—root and branch—and to try and replace them by a system of panchayets.

What the non-co-operation panchayets are like.

There is one aspect of the question which requires thorough exposure. The extremists tell the people indiscriminately—"Do not go to British Courts of Law. Form your own courts, make your own decisions. We will support you." Much mischief would not have arisen if the matter had been taken in hand by, and courts of arbitration or panchayets composed of, the educated leaders. But they merely did the preaching and propaganda, and their advice was followed by the ordinary people who have not enough intelligence or moral sense and most of whom belong to the ignorant and savage

classes. What the result of such a movement divested of control and supervision by the Government with safeguards for revision, would be, are foregone conclusions and does not require much imagination. Because the mass of the villagers are uneducated and ignorant and possess the vein of cruelty common to rough and ignorant classes all over the world, the decisions of the panchayets constituted by them are also savage. Whereas, the educated extremists delude themselves into thinking that their courts of arbitration or panchayets, which have been set up all over the country as a result of their propaganda, are replicas of courts of justice presided over by unbiassed judges with counsel or pleaders to represent the parties, and rules for orderly production of evidence. A panchayet is actually a different thing. It consists of anybody who cares to be present. There are no rules and no president. Those with the loudest tongues, or of the most forcible character, dominate the assembly. Witnesses are shouted at and interrupted. As a rule, the members of the assembly have made up their minds before they meet. In cases where the accused is a person of no standing, his condemnation is a foregone conclusion, particularly when the panchayet is composed of classes who find satisfaction in baiting a man who cannot retaliate.*

Monstrous panchayet decisions and grave results thereof.

No one with any common sense would have taken the responsibility of setting up a panchayet where the necessary restraints by way of supervision and powers of revision were lacking. But the non-co-operators have set up their panchayets with the direct object of opposing the existing government and thus these institutions cannot expect Government support. And without this, how can they enforce the attendance of a party who is reluctant to submit to such a panchayet, or enforce a decision which a party refuses to accept? The non-co-operation methods of execution so far suggested and

followed are coercion and social boycott and ostracism. We have in evidence that wherever these have been attempted, serious trouble followed.

Illustrations.

The whole trouble at Giridih arose out of the fact that a certain panchayet, formed at the instance of the non-co-operators, gave in a case a decision which one of the parties concerned refused to accept. The non-co-operators therefore directed that he and all his family should be boycotted. Not only was the bazaar made to refuse to supply him with provisions, **but steps were taken to even prevent him and his family obtaining water from the village wells.** These steps were of a nature which finally led to a charge of assault being entered against the man who had either taken upon himself or was entrusted with the task of seeing that the orders of the panchayet were obeyed. The attempt by the authorities to secure a legal investigation into the man's conduct was answered by a hostile demonstration by a crowd of several thousands of people, who finally gave vent to their violent outburst and excitement by committing a very serious riot. It should be noted that the war cry of these people, as in every demonstration of this kind, was, **Gandhi Maharajki Jai !!!**

Now, even supposing that the original decision of the panchayet was a just one, it is obvious that in later directing that not only the man but his whole family should be deprived of the barest necessities of life, the court of arbitration was acting with a most **surpassing want of humanity.** What had the wretched defendant's daughter done that she should be forbidden the use of the wells which certainly the non-co-operators did not dig or own. In no community pretending to any degree of civilisation, would punishments of this kind be imposed. And it is not as if this decision at Giridih was only a solitary instance of a panchayet indulging in acts of gross inhumanity.

A very large number of cases have taken place recently in which men, for some quite trivial fault,

and in many cases while acting quite within their personal rights, as for instance, when drinking liquor, have, by order of a panchayet, been seized, had their heads shaved, their faces painted, **and been paraded through the streets with a necklace of old and torn shoes, a target for a ribald and cruel crowd composed of the dregs of the population.**

A case was reported from Darbhanga in which a panchayet punished a woman who had assaulted another by having her head shaved, her face painted with tar and lime and transporting her to the Nepal borders.

Another atrocious case of a parody of justice perpetrated by a non-co-operation court has been reported from Gorakhpur district. In February last a quarrel took place between two low caste women and on the night succeeding the quarrel the house of one of them caught fire. She forthwith raised an alarm and accused the other woman with whom she had been quarrelling as being responsible for it. A panchayet was assembled the next morning and the accused woman was declared guilty of incendiarism. In spite of the *Mukhia's* advice to send the case to the court, the Panchayet refused on the ground that it was the order of Mahatma Gandhi that they should decide the case themselves. The sentence they pronounced was hideous and inhuman. *The woman was to receive five kicks from each villager,* but on account of her age and constitution this was commuted into the following:—

"She was stripped half naked, her face was blackened with a dark dye, the parting of her hair was covered with white lime and she was made to ride on an ass. Her hair was clipped and she was garlanded with Bel, and some of this heavy fruit was tied to her hair to enhance the torture. In this way she was taken in ignominy and shame from village to village, followed by a concourse of men from the neighbourhood. In addition to this torture, she was fined Rs. 15 by the panchayet."

It is superfluous to point the moral. The members of the panchayet who were responsible for these

sentences have been prosecuted and received suitable sentences of imprisonment. When however such *horrible and inhuman punishments* are inflicted as in the cases cited above and the members of the panchayet concerned are prosecuted, a hue and cry is at once raised by the non-co-operators that government is suppressing this "national movement." Those who support panchayets which pass such barbarous and revolting sentences for trivial offences have no right to condemn the indignities inflicted on Indians in the Punjab by a few officials, and the sooner they repudiate them the better for themselves and the country.

Further doctrines : Are panchayets necessary under Gandhism?

Mr. Gandhi declared only a few months ago in connection with the Nankana Sahib tragedy—"The purest way of seeking justice against offenders is not to seek it." Mr. Gandhi in his booklet "Indian Home Rule" advised that murderers, thieves and dacoits, etc., should not be punished, but that attempts should be made to reclaim them by advice and lectures. We do not see any consistency in the part of the exponents of these doctrines who are setting up an agitation for the establishment of panchayets for the trial of cases independently of the established courts all over the country. Why cannot they leave the wrong doers and the breakers of civil contracts to their fate to be cured by the operation of the doctrine of "soul force"?

Lessons for practical guidance.

It is well known that Government has every wish to extend, with proper safeguards, the powers of panchayets in the management of local affairs, but there is a great difference between this and the assumption of powers by ignorant and self-sufficient villagers. In the one case, only those persons are selected for judicial and magisterial offices who are reasonable and intelligent people. Their proceedings are subject to revision and appeal, and their

powers are strictly limited by statute. By these means necessary experience is gained and mistakes are avoided. In the other case, malice and ignorance move unchecked.

It has now become recognised as a part of the non-co-operation propaganda to establish panchayets, and it is boldly proclaimed that these amateur institutions will do away with the necessity of having recourse to the ordinary courts of law. We have drawn attention to the frequent abuses of the powers which panchayets have arrogated to themselves. It is the natural result of uneducated villagers meddling in the affairs of their neighbours without the guiding restraint of supervision. Perhaps one of the most difficult tasks of civilised society is to arrange for the impartial settlement of the simplest disputes between individuals. It is only after countless generations of experience, and the careful record of numberless precedents, that the everyday business of litigation in civilised countries has attained its present-day efficiency. The obliteration of passion and prejudice has only been accomplished by the most gradual steps, and attempts to undertake functions which require the most highly trained intelligence must inevitably end in a parody of justice.

We felt that no one ought to have been more shocked than Mr. Gandhi himself when he became aware of the lamentable results which followed the attempts to put into practical form some of his ideal views of Swaraj. But in the zeal for his cause, Mr. Gandhi has overlooked human nature and even now he is just as obstinate in his propaganda to bring about a complete boycott of the existing law courts without taking any serious steps to erect suitable institutions to replace them.

CHAPTER VIII.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE PROBLEMS OF CASTE AND UNTOUCHABILITY.

Social reform is a very good thing but extremism must be avoided on both sides. The elevation of the "depressed classes" is a problem which has been taxing the resources of a large number of social reformers for some decades. Mr. Gandhi has however hit upon the idea of tackling the problem which no other reformer has so far dared to suggest, viz., to make this social reform question a part of his general political propaganda. Mr. Gandhi replying to an address which was given to him by the Municipal Commissioners of Surat said:—

"Unless and until you eat with the sweepers and **mehters** and some in contact with them, you will not get Swaraj."

It appears that many congress committees all over India have accepted Mr. Gandhi's creed in this matter, and the question of untouchability is mentioned as being a definite part of non-co-operation propaganda.

We fail to understand why Swaraj should be contingent on free intercourse and interdining with **chamars, methers** and people of other depressed classes. Here we find ideas of democracy with a vengeance. Of course to people in Europe and elsewhere out of India who do not understand the Indian social structure, the sentiment quoted above will not appear very surprising ; but in India there is hardly a man professing any kind of caste at all, outside those mentioned, who will not declare that Mr. Gandhi is asking for an impossibility. It is apparent that under Mr. Gandhi's scheme of Swaraj all men will have to live on the same level. But this raises a question of serious import for the followers of the Sanatan Dharma.

A menace to "Sanatan Dharma" and Hindu social polity.

Hinduism in the eyes of far the greater majority of Hindus is something more than a religion. It is a social system and polity. It attaches more importance to conduct (achara and acharan) on certain lines than to belief. A man indeed may profess a belief in any religion he likes, but he remains a Hindu as long as he does not infringe the rules of caste with regard to eating and drinking, and so on. The very lowest castes may be excited and triumphant when they hear of the new movement, and having secured the support of the depressed classes by rousing them with hopes of a better social status, it would be possible for Mr. Gandhi and his followers to use them as tools in other directions to serve their own ends for political propaganda. Who can blame these people for actively supporting the movement, one of the objects of which is to elevate them and to give them a social position beyond their own most sanguine expectations? But the others, particularly the "twice born" are aghast. And so we come to another Extremist folly. In their attempt to rouse antagonism against Government they are creating daily fresh enemies for themselves amongst the very people whose assistance they hope to gain. The following taken from the Allahabad 'Leader' makes in this connection very instructive reading :—

"The Venkateshwar Samachar of Bombay (an extremist and non-co-operating vernacular paper having a wide circulation) in its issue of the 10th June comes out with the alarm **"Ghor Sankat Men Hindu Dharma"** (Hindu religion in great danger). It devotes about three columns to Mr. Gandhi's new move for the uplift of the depressed classes. It says that if an "Indian nation" could be constructed only out of the débris of the existing Varnashrama system then it would not have it. It is prepared to accord all sympathy and good wishes to the untouchables, but it would not tolerate the obliteration of untouchability

which is imposed by the Hindu Shastras! It says—‘If you cannot get Swaraj without removal of untouchability, Mahatmaji, then we also will have none of your Swaraj at such a heavy cost.’ Then in a very philosophical manner and with righteous disgust it dubs the blind followers of Mahatmaji as sheep and exhorts its readers to beware. It concludes thus with a note on suspicion: ‘The depressed classes must be treated in the way enjoined by the Shastras. Mahatmaji cannot make any change in this. If he dare do it, **Sanatan Dharma** Hindus will not accept it: some of the thoughtful may even suspect that when Mahatma Gandhi and his fellow-thinkers secure Swaraj and become all in all, they may injure our **Sanatan Dharma.**”

This is the turn that a non-co-operating paper, having a wide circulation, takes when it has to face the real problem of the uplift of the depressed classes. It was on happy hunting ground so long as it played with the general principles of boycott and the refined art of abusing the Liberals, but when the shoe began to pinch, it worked itself up into a wild and indecent panic.

Mr. Gandhi not sure of his position : What is a truly democratic instinct?

Mr. Gandhi, by his previous professions, did not appear to have been out for the destruction of all caste differences. As regards this problem, he said not long ago, that the caste system would have to be relieved of many deplorable excrescences, but that he upheld the four original castes as laid down in the Vedas, and even their hereditary character, though in practice those born in a lower caste might always rise by their own merit and secure the respect of the highest castes. This view, however, is not compatible with his recent pronouncement that in order to make India fit for Swaraj, all Hindus—high and low—should associate with **chamars** and **methers** and dine with them!

What is called the democratic instinct has very little relation to associating and eating with **methers** and other similar people. The latter is entirely a matter of personal taste and habit. The democratic instinct, properly so called, implies something very much higher. It means a scrupulous regard for the rights of others, respect for man as man, due recognition of the dignity of labour, and fair treatment for all, irrespective of class or creed. This instinct, when properly developed, is a great asset in the life of a people. The basic ideas of civilisation spring from this source: kind and generous treatment of all being the key-note. In other words what is called the liberal spirit is the best expression of the democratic instinct. It shows itself in all spheres of human life—in our relations not only with our fellow human beings, but also with the lower animals. Simply sitting down to eat with **chamars**, **methers** and others will effect very little by way of real improvement.

Extremists' folly : Practice of non-co-operation in social matters: Result of tampering with masses: Tables turned.

It appears that the Extremists have let loose a veritable hornet's nest by their propaganda and that they are now being paid back in their own coin. One thing among many which is emerging from the non-co-operation welter is that the Brahmins are likely to have a thin time under Swaraj. A new movement in the Maharastra is exciting a great deal of comment in the Bombay papers. It appears that the Marathas have learnt the non-co-operation and boycott lessons only too well and are now employing these activities against the Brahmins. Potters, washermen, and barbers have all gone on strike, so far as the Brahmin is concerned. The Maratha declines to employ Brahmin priests, or cultivate Brahmin lands. The leading extremist Poona papers, while still declaring that they are all for non-co-operation, are now appealing to the Government to put an end to the **Satya shodak** movement as it is called. The Keshari has even found a legal weapon for the district magistrate under section 153A.

*Another paper declares that Brahmins have begun to believe that **Satyasamajists** and not the British are ruling in Satara. But surely the Poona press is denying its own principles when it asks the Government to intervene, and it should be rejoicing at rather than regretting the fact that British rule no longer obtains at Satara. Is it not just this negation of British rule that the extremists are working for?*

The following paragraphs are extracted from the 'Leader' (Allahabad) and will be interesting reading:—

"Some time ago we had occasion to refer to the furious rage of the Maratta at the doings of the **Satyashodaks** who made it impossible for the Brahmins to enjoy their dinner at a certain festival and who had ultimately to go away hungry as the result of the truculent attitude of these non-Brahmin extremists. These **Satyashodaks**, it appears, are carrying on a regular non-co-operation campaign against the Brahmins in the Satara district. The "Times of India" states that the Maratha declines to employ Brahmin priests or to cultivate the lands of Brahmin landlords: the potters refuse to make pots for them, the watermen to fetch them water and the barbers to shave them. Thus the doughty preachers of non-co-operation with government find themselves hoisted with their own petard and being made the victims of non-co-operation against themselves. We have often pointed out the mischievous possibilities of the development of the spirit of non-co-operation in the social sphere, and the Deccan Brahmins are now realising what a monster they have let loose. The whole of the Brahmin press, which was advising the country to adopt non-co-operation and drive out the "satanic" government is now making frantic appeals to that very government."

One paper bewails that it is the "**Satyasamajists** and not the British who are ruling." If this is so, then surely Swaraj has been established. The "Keshari," the mighty organ of non-co-operation,

writes: 'Is it not the duty of the District Magistrate to use his powers of censorship or to proceed under Section 153A?' Just think of it, a "nationalist" paper suggesting prosecution for non-violent non-co-operation !!! Further, it writes: 'Will the just and capable Governor of Bombay make a timely endeavour to remove this dark stain attaching to his administration.' Just and capable governor! What a fall, indeed, for the 'Keshari' to utter such a blasphemy from the non-co-operators' point of view! It concludes: 'It is useless to expect that government officers will put an end to this evil.....' Hence our advice to those Brahmins who are opposed to this sort of oppression is that they should make up their minds that there is no British rule in the Satara district.' On this the "Times of India" makes the following comment: 'We ask what more do they want? They have asked for it and got it, and now they don't like it.'

Comment would only spoil a situation so entirely precious as that outlined above.

CHAPTER IX.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND TAMPERING WITH THE MASSES.

Mr. Gandhi gave the following solemn advice to the non-co-operators in February last :—

“We must not tamper with the masses. It is dangerous to make political use of factory labourers or the peasantry—not that we are not entitled to do so, but we are not ready for it. We have neglected their political (as distinguished from literary) education all these long years. We have not got enough honest, intelligent, reliable and brave workers to enable us to act upon these countrymen of ours.”

Further, writing in the Allahabad *Independent* in the same month, Mr. Gandhi emphasized the objection he made in his own paper to the use of “strikes” as a political weapon. He does not deny that strikes can serve political ends, but he adds that they do not fall within his scheme. “It does not require,” he writes, “much effort of the intellect to perceive that it is a most dangerous thing to make political use of labour until labourers understand the political condition of the country and are prepared to work for the common good.” It would therefore appear that Mr. Gandhi’s direction to his followers is quite clear. But we shall see that no principle has been more abused in practice by Mr. Gandhi’s followers, and occasionally by Mr. Gandhi himself, as this dangerous game of making political use of the masses.

Original non-co-operation programme confined to the educated community.

No one can deny that the original programme, when the non-co-operation movement was first launched, was to keep it confined to the educated

classes. But Mr. Gandhi subsequently found that he failed to a great extent with that class. His efforts, in so far as the boycott of the councils was concerned, have been a failure : the number of titles surrendered has been very small, and so far as we know, very few lawyers have given up the fees which they earn by their practice in the law courts. We saw instances of a few pleaders temporarily suspending practice for a short time and thereby securing cheap applause, but only to return again to the old game when their pockets began to feel the pinch. It is true that the movement was a temporary success among immature students, but even that success was effervescent and passed away, for most of the young men, under better advice and influence, returned to their schools and colleges. Seeing that he was unsuccessful in these directions—Mr. Gandhi, or his lieutenants more than he—have turned from the educated classes and tried to secure success for their movement by creating unrest among the masses : and therein lie great potentialities for danger and mischief. We have at present much economic unrest, much political unrest—partly local and partly caused by world-wide causes—and these it is possible for any evil-minded man to use for evil purposes at the present time. It is very easy to arouse ill-feeling and passion at a juncture like the present, and that, we fear, is the course which many of these non-co-operators are pursuing.

How are they influencing and rousing the masses :

We have outlined above the stages by which the non-co-operation leaders have arrived at a position in which they must tamper with the masses if the movement has to be sustained at all. Hence we find that Mr. Gandhi overrides his original doctrines published only a couple of months before about the unsuitability of tampering with the masses for political purposes, and we see him declaring before the meeting of the All-India Congress committee in Bezwada on 31st March as follows :—" that in order to achieve

the programme of Swaraj within the time mentioned in the Nagpur Congress Resolution, they should now concentrate upon those parts of it which would directly lead the masses of this country to its realisation. The awakening of the masses was phenomenal, and while the masses were fully alive to the urgent need of the realisation of Swaraj the leaders were lagging behind. It was therefore necessary to give form and shape to the aspirations of the masses. Their aspirations for Swaraj were based upon the very definite perception, that without Swaraj their condition could not improve and the direct means of improving their condition was to enable them to clothe and feed themselves. It was for this purpose that he felt that the charka movement was full of the utmost potentialities in the winning of Swaraj. It would immediately have the effect of making them feel that they were no longer dependent on foreigners for their livelihood and progress. It would also effect the complete economic boycott of the most important of the foreign imports of this country. If this was achieved Swaraj could be considered to have been realised".

We have discussed the unsoundness of the charka programme in its appropriate place, and it needs no reiteration here. But we must notice here, that according to Mr. Gandhi's programme, the charka cult is one of the methods by which he intends to rouse the masses.

If the mass movement ended with the charka, we would not have much reason to find fault with the extremists' methods. We are in entire agreement with Mr. Gandhi's statement—"The beauty of this scheme (meaning the charka movement) is that in it there is no hint of violence and that it nowhere presents any opportunity for the Government to retaliate." It is very difficult to make weapons of any kind out of yarn and the more people stay at home and spin, the less likely are they to come into collision with the police, and by no means could the most despotic of governments find in the charka anything that is seditious or revolutionary. But if it is not revolutionary except in the sense that it only spins, how is it

going to bring about the revolution that the extremists desire? The extremist agents and lecturers—paid and honorary—have begun therefore to rouse the masses by serious misrepresentations and violent lying speeches, and the mass movement to-day is no longer confined to the charka cult but it now embraces a wider field.

Methods of the non-co-operators.

They owe the success they have so far gained chiefly by coercing or deluding those whom they would influence. It may be true that as followers of Gandhi they profess non-violence, but they have by lies convinced the mass of the people that Gandhi is a divine being whom the Government have tried but failed to destroy, and in his name they threaten people with punishments unless they yield implicit obedience to all commands issued in the name of Gandhi. The honorary title of Maharaj attached to Gandhi's name has further contributed to a sense of unreality about his actual personality, and many ignorant people honestly think that he is really a forceful potentate of the type of the ex-Kaiser or the like. And the masses seeing that the bulk of the extremist agents and unscrupulous speakers are allowed to preach in this manner without let or hindrance, naturally conclude that Gandhi really has the power to protect them against the Government, that is to say—that Gandhi is stronger than Government. This belief in the omnipotence of Gandhi is the cause of all the hartals, rioting and other methods by which the non-co-operators show their enmity to the established government.

The general idea, as the extremists have constantly declared, was to break the connection between India and the rest of the Empire. The methods employed in order to sever this connection have taken the form of hartals and boycotts, passive resistance, formation of panchayets or courts of arbitration, the fomenting of strikes, agitation amongst the peasantry, withdrawal of children from

educational institutions, temperance reform by force or show of force without the basis of morality and spirituality, attempting to isolate government and its servants by preaching race hatred in order to bring the Government and their officers, European and Indian, into hatred and contempt, and so on. These and other reprehensible methods are forming part of a general plan and are designed to isolate the Government and to make normal administration impossible. The masses are not amenable to reason or logical argument, and they require appeals to their emotions and sentiments to catch their imagination, if they are to be carried along with the agitators. We have remarked above that the present world unrest has affected the masses also, and masses have their own peculiar grievances as do others. These grievances, which, it will be observed, are invariably stated in such fashion as to emphasise racial feelings and to exploit the herd instinct, are at present of incalculable value to the extremists, for they enable them to frame an appeal to the other emotions which supply the directing force to the whole movement.

Grave dangers involved in the mass movement : A warning for the future.

We have seen attempts to delude and arouse the school boys and the villagers. As the immediate results thereof, we have had waves of emotion and local riots and tumults. It is true that the non-co-operation movement proceeds under the motto of "peaceful methods." But how far can the promoters of the movement believe in their hearts that such a campaign as theirs will spread amongst the masses of India and still retain its peaceful character? But whether the direction of the movement be deliberately reckless or merely visionary, there can be no doubt of the dangers which it involves. It appeals to the most emotional and ignorant classes in the persons of schoolboys and villagers, whose judgment on public matters is necessarily weak, and it tells them that

the whole existing system of the government of this country is wrong in inspiration and in method, and that health and happiness can only come by concerted action to make that government impossible.

The extremists are steadily attempting to teach the lowest classes to defy authority in every shape or form. It is not only disrespect for the British that is being inculcated, but disrespect for caste also. Brahmin landlords as well as officials have been assaulted by mobs composed of persons who at one time regarded the castes above them as superior in every way. In future how will the Brahmins and others of the "twice-born" control these castes, on which the fundamental basis of Hinduism rests? How will public servants discharge their duties properly if they are persistently made the target of not only vile abuse, but of assault and other indignities? They grow more violent and less restrained every day. At the present moment they act up to a point at the behest of the extremist leaders, but one has seen time and again how a mob summoned to some act of passive resistance has finally indulged in resistance which is very far from being passive, ignoring the prayers and the entreaties of the leaders. We are aware that the latter assert, after the tumult has taken place and men have been seriously hurt or killed, that the affair was the result of provocation offered by the authorities: but can they really believe what they say? In their inmost hearts they must know it is not true, and that what has happened is that the mob they excited has behaved after the manner of all excited mobs. Later on, the mobs will assemble not at the behest of the educated men, but at the behest of prominent hooligans. Once the masses in India begin to believe that they can adjust any real or fancied grievance by taking the law into their own hands, panchayets may begin to summon before them others besides those of their own class. The rich houses and the wealth of vakils and merchants may begin to have the same attraction as police-outposts, excise shops, and government buildings have now. That is what has happened in every country in which

the people called the intelligentsia have played with the passions and emotions of the ignorant mob, and it is much more likely to happen in India than anywhere else, because here we have no great middle class to hold the balance.

CHAPTER X.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE STRIKES AND "HARTALS."

We have remarked on several occasions that Mr. Gandhi has proved himself to be a failure when the question of enforcing his directions is concerned—that he is powerless to control the demon which he himself has let loose—and several illustrations can be given to show how his clear injunctions have been flouted by some of his prominent followers, not to speak of the irresponsible rabble—the people of the herd-instinct—who hold senseless demonstrations and shout "Gandhi Maharajki Jai" at the dictates of the so-called leaders. The problem of the strikes and hartals is an instance of this.

Mr. Gandhi's view.

We have shown how Mr. Gandhi deprecated the attempt to make political use of labour, and declared that the fomenting of labour strikes did not fall within his scheme. His attitude towards unauthorised strikes and hartals may be gathered from his declaration at Karachi on 26th April, wherein he expressed profound displeasure with the holding of unauthorised hartals, and he added that "this foolishness spoilt his good name and discredited the practice of hartal which, properly used, was a formidable weapon."

Mr. Gandhi's directions to his followers are quite clear, but we find that many of his prominent followers are guilty of intentional breaches of these injunctions.

Two parties in the extremist ranks.

It would appear that there are two parties in the extremist ranks. One party agrees with Mr. Gandhi

that strikes, hartals, and the movements of a similar kind, have failed to create the atmosphere they were intended to induce, and must therefore be abandoned. Many Indians, including some non-co-operators, are taking the view that processions and demonstrations outside law courts, police stations and other public places should cease, because they are very likely to lead to conflicts and collisions. Indeed, they have already led to such collisions with the result that mobs have destroyed property or battered in-offensive people to death, and have in turn been fired upon by the police. The abuses of the strikes and hartals may, at any moment, be repeated elsewhere, if the practice of assembling mobs, composed as much of hooligans as of others, to put pressure on any particular party or a section of the public be continued.

But Mr. Gandhi's name is also employed by another party of extremists who only accept his leadership and obey his orders when it suits them to do so. They are all for strikes, unauthorised and meaningless hartals, processions, and anything likely to create an atmosphere of bad blood on every conceivable occasion, petty or serious. From time to time, they obtain great influence over some section of the population and over certain parts of the country, working, as they do, by gross misrepresentation and terrorism. The positive harm they do to the people at large is very great and in no respect do they do any real good. It is to be noted that this latter party is more in prominence in their nefarious work than the former who has not yet been able to show much influence over the masses.

Illustration from the Chandpur episode.

As a pertinent illustration of the tactless and insane organisation of strikes and hartals, which can have only the effect of oppressing whole communities and people at large, we may simply notice here the Eastern Bengal strikes and hartals engineered and kept up by the agitators in connection with the Assam coolie exodus. Let us shortly

discuss the salient features of this muddle and try to draw a moral therefrom.

We all know, and the extremist local leaders did not conceal this fact in the beginning, that the strikes and hartals at Chandpur, which gradually spread over almost the entire Assam Bengal Railway, the connected steamer services, and in many other places of East Bengal, were sympathetic, and that they had been fostered and kept up by way of an active protest against the manner in which the Government of Bengal handled the coolie situation at Chandpur.

Much criticism has been directed against the Bengal Government for refusing to use the public funds of Bengal to transport coolies from Assam to the United Provinces and other places. This refusal, however, prevented no benevolent persons from paying the fares of the coolies. What effectually stopped the repatriation of the tea-garden workers was the strike declared by way of expressing sympathy with their sufferings. From the beginning to the end, the Railway and Steamer strikes were blunders. No labour leader in Europe would have been so short-sighted as to proclaim a strike which would infallibly defeat his own professed object. No political chief would have permitted such a foolish move on the part of local amateurs. "My experience," said Mr. Andrews, "is that the strike is a weapon never to be used lightly ; that a political strike is almost certain to confuse the issues ; that, if begun in a wrong way, it will end in misery and want to the poor people. It can only be employed with wisdom and a foresight that has been won by generations of education and experience and that is not yet present here in this country." Mr. Andrews, in this matter at any rate, is right, for he speaks from experience. It is known, moreover, that Mr. Gandhi is strongly opposed to the exploitation of the working classes for political purposes. Writing about the Chandpur strikes, Mr. Gandhi stated :—

" Mr. Andrews deplored the sympathetic strike of the steamship employees. Whosoever

instigated it did an ill-service to the labourers. In India we want no political strikes. We are not yet instructed enough for them. Now to hate political strikes is to forward the cause of freedom. We do not need an atmosphere of unsettled unrest. It hampers our progress towards final stages of our programme. A soldier who runs amok is unfit to be in the army. We must gain control over all the unruly and disturbing elements or isolate them even as we are isolating the government. The only way, therefore, we can help strikers, is to give them help and relief, **when they have struck for their own bona fide grievances.** We must sedulously prevent all other strikes."

Why then were the strikes kept up ?

We may well ask why the strikes, which were contrary to the wishes of Mr. Gandhi and to the judgment of his English lieutenant, were still continued in spite of Mr. Gandhi's denunciations ? Is the non-co-operation movement merely an unrest which has no guiding head or hand ? The Bengal leaders themselves were divided on this question, and Babu Krishna Kumar Mitra, Mr. Jitendra Lal Banerjee, Babu Syam Sundar Chakravarty and others who opposed these strikes and hartals have all been thrown overboard, and the other party apparently led by Mr. C. R. Das, designated **Desha-bandhu**, have carried everything before them. Even Mr. C. R. Das hoped that satisfactory terms might soon be arranged between the steamer companies and the crews. Then why did the strikes persist ? The reason was supplied by Mr. Padmaraj Jain, who speaking before a meeting on the Chandpur affairs presided over by Mr. S. S. Chakravarty, said that the steamship strike was most ill-advised, and he further gave it as his opinion that in continuing the strike the organisers had *been actuated by the same motives of prestige of which they accused Government.*

Mr. C. R. Das's justification of the strike and its continuance.

Mr. C. R. Das wrote as follows in the statement he issued to the press on the Chandpur affairs :—

“I have personally asked several of the railway employees and every one of them has assured me that it is not their own grievances but the situation at Chandpur which induced him to join. The Railway strike therefore is spontaneous, unselfish, and is part of the general movement of non-co-operation in the whole Division. One must not forget that the whole Bar here, at Comilla, at Chittagong and at Noakhali joined the *hartal*. I have nothing to urge against the general policy of the Congress that labour disputes should not be exploited for congress purposes. I adhere to that principle strictly and whole-heartedly. One of my reasons for my coming here was to see for myself whether these so-called strikes originated in labour disputes. My deliberate conclusion is that it is not so. The local leaders also took the same view.”

The answer to why the steamer strike occurred, says Mr. Das :—

“Is the same..... and the strike which followed is certainly not a labour strike.” Mr. C. R. Das further added—“It was an act of noble sacrifice and as such I welcome it and give it my whole-hearted support.

Non-co-operation when sincere and whole-hearted never admits of the counting of costs. I rejoice in this wonderful activity within the whole division and almost in the whole of East Bengal. The honour of Bengal demands that it should be encouraged and supported.”

The strikes in their true colours: Mr. C. R. Das's statement contradicted: Lord Ronaldshay speaks out.

Much argument is not necessary to expose the utter hollowness of the eulogy expressed by Mr. Das.

The suspicion which must occur to most minds is that those who induced the men to leave their duty and the crews to desert their steamers were unable to bring back either group of strikers. Hence the ingenious efforts which were made to justify the strike. But as time went on, they repeated their formula with diminishing conviction, and on almost all sides there was a demand that the strikes should end. Even the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* said candidly—"We think now that the coolies have been almost repatriated and the indignation of the nation has been sufficiently expressed by the strikes and otherwise for the cruel policy of the Government, there is no use continuing the strike." The local leaders and their supporters therefore found themselves in a fix. On the one side there was public pressure to put an end to the strike, and on the other the unfortunate strikers, who were merely deluded tools in the hands of the agitators. Endeavours were therefore made to restore the strikers on the basis of complete indemnity for all that they had done. The demand had been presented that the break in their service was to be condoned and they were to be paid as if they had never struck. It is scarcely necessary to show that the conditions thus laid down were inconsistent with the eloquent words in which Mr. Das eulogised the strikers. He has dwelt upon their unselfishness, their sacrifices, their firm stand for the principles of non-co-operation. But if there is to be no sacrifice and if the strikers insist that they shall be paid for the time in which they voluntarily abstained from work, it will be impossible to resist the inference that the strikers did not understand what they were doing, or for what cause they were supposed to be fighting. They had been, it must be concluded, merely tools of others in the carrying out of a strike which, in spite of Mr. Das's sophisms, was opposed to the principles of the Congress and to the injunctions of Mr. Gandhi.

Lord Ronaldshay, in replying to the deputation of the East Bengal merchants on the Chandpur trouble, stated as follows :—

" You have represented to me the loss and inconvenience which are being caused to people of all classes in East Bengal by the strikes on the railway and on the steamer services. In other words you have dealt with the practical results of the non-co-operation movement. I will follow your example. Take the cause of these strikes. They are not economic strikes, that is to say the strikers did not go on strike on account of dissatisfaction with their conditions of service. That has been made quite clear by Mr. C. R. Das himself. He has publicly stated that one of his reasons for going to Chandpur was to see for himself whether the strikes were labour strikes, and his deliberate conclusion is that they are not. He goes further and says that the railway strike is part of the general movement of non-co-operation in that part of the province. It is perhaps worth while pointing out in this connection that Mr. Gandhi has roundly condemned such strikes. He has stated quite definitely that he does not want an atmosphere of unsettled unrest ; and he has stated that strikes other than *bonâ fide* strikes for the redress of grievances, must be sedulously prevented. It is clear, therefore, that the persons who have organised these strikes have done so in defiance of Mr. Gandhi's wishes.

" However, the question to which you have addressed yourselves is a practical one, namely, have these strikes benefitted the people or have they inflicted suffering upon them? There can be no two opinions as to that. They have been the source of immense suffering and hardship to the people in all directions. According to Mr. Andrews, they have been the cause of many unnecessary deaths and much demoralisation among the coolies at Chandpur. In other words these unnecessary deaths were due to non-co-operation, for let me remind you once more that Mr. C. R. Das has told us quite explicitly that they are part of the non-co-operation movement.

When the coolies who were spreading cholera were removed from the station premises at Chandpur there was a chorus of denunciation. Some of the coolies admittedly received bruises in the scuffle ; a matter for sincere regret. But their removal was clearly necessary and there were no deaths nor were any bones broken in the process of their removal. Non-co-operation, on the other hand, has been responsible for many unnecessary deaths. Is there no indignation at these unnecessary deaths? And if not, what are we to think of it? I leave you to draw your own conclusions. In the first place, this particular form of non-co-operation has inflicted grievous and unnecessary injury upon the unfortunate coolies. What has been its result so far as the general population is concerned? It has undoubtedly been to cause grave hardship to enormous numbers. I have myself received telegrams from various parts of Eastern Bengal complaining bitterly not only of inconvenience caused to all who have to travel and of the general dislocation of trade, but also of the general rise in prices, which is inflicting much suffering on people of all classes, particularly the poor. I have seen it stated that potatoes and flour are selling in Chittagong at 8 annas a seer and onions at one rupee. The price of salt, oil and other necessities has been **driven up over large areas in Eastern Bengal.**

“This, then, is a further result of non-co-operation. Against all this misery is there anything to put to the credit of the movement? I confess I can find nothing. The unfortunate repatriated tea garden coolies have, in some cases at any rate, been reduced to a parlous plight. Many of them, according to the testimony of Swamy Darsananda, find themselves outcastes and homeless beggars. The strikers on the railway and the steamers have certainly gained nothing. Indeed they have lost and are still losing a great deal. Mr. C. R. Das seems

to have realised this, for he says that "non-co-operation when sincere and whole-hearted never admits of the counting of costs." And referring to the results of non-co-operation on the people at large, he says that they have "cheerfully undertaken the sacrifice." All I can say is that the telegrams and other representations which I have received and your own representations to me to-day, far from suggesting a spirit of cheerful sacrifice, contain nothing but bitter complaints.

"Mr. Sultan Ahmad writing from Noakhali has declared that the masses "from their bitter experience of these days have been led to believe that the leaders of the non-co-operation movement can only destroy and have nothing to construct ; they can create distress and have not the means to alleviate it". Indeed Mr. Das himself seems to have realised that his earlier statement that the general public has cheerfully undertaken the sacrifices involved by non-co-operation was something of an overstatement, for in a further statement made to the press on June 26th, he declared that the public must be educated to suffer loss and inconvenience to further the cause of Swaraj and non-co-operation. If they have already cheerfully undergone the sacrifice, why should this process of education be necessary"?

Mr. C. R. Das further exposed.

It should be noted that Mr. Das issued his bombastic statement referred to above on the 12th June, in which he apparently took the position of an impartial and unbiassed judge who went to study the problem on the spot. We however find from a telegram dated 2nd June, from an occasional correspondent of "Amrita Bazar Patrika" that Deshabandhu Das addressed an enthusiastic meeting at Goalundo and "urged the continuance of the strike till his return from Chandpur." Then we find the following in the press telegram, dated June 6th, from Chandpur:—"Mr. Andrews Mr. C. R. Das and Bimola Swami who went to Chittagong to negotiate with the Agent of the

A. B. Ry., about the railway employees' strike returned yesterday evening.....It is reported that Mr. Andrews' negotiations proved unsuccessful." What these negotiations were about would be made clear by the press telegram dated June 4th, from Chittagong:—"Mr. C. F. Andrews arrived at Chittagong at midday on Friday, June 3rd, and had an interview with the Deputy Agent of the Assam Bengal Railway concerning the railway strike. The acting Agent, together with the Deputy Agent, saw Mr. Andrews the next morning and the consultation was continued. Mr. Nolan stated that the Railway Union in its present form and constitution could not be recognised. He also affirmed that strike pay could on no account be given, and that the breach of service caused by the strike could not be condoned. There would, however, be no victimisation or stoppage of promotion if the railway employees went back to their work."

It is therefore quite easy to see as to why Mr. Das accompanied Mr. Andrews to Chittagong. The railway employees were made to come out from work in a hasty moment at the bidding of the agitators, and subsequently they discovered that they had foolishly acted, as under the departmental rules they ran the risk of losing not only their pay for the days during which they absented themselves from work, but that they were also forfeiting their gratuity. Hence the negotiations on behalf of the railway employees by those who have otherwise vowed non-co-operation! Hence these attempts by these leaders to try to see whether the unfortunate tools of extremist propaganda could be indemnified as if nothing had happened.

A few days after, Mr. Andrews made the following statement about the question of strike-pay and indemnity :—

"There was a system prevalent on all Indian Railways of giving a gratuity, which the men called *bakshesh*, on the condition that the men never struck. It was really a form of strike

insurance and was regarded by the railway authorities as such. What seemed not to be sufficiently understood was that this gratuity acted on the whole against the interests of the companies. The Railwaymen never thought of the gratuity when they went out on strike in hot blood ; but when the blood got cooler and they wanted to come back they were told that they have forfeited their gratuity. This more than any other cause kept them out on strike."

The subsequent ingenious attempt therefore on the part of Mr. Das and his confederates to justify the strike and its continuance on the so-called grounds of patriotism proves nothing but utter disregard for truth on the part of these extremists, who dare to take upon themselves the rôle of National Leaders and who pose as high-priests of the cult of "soul force." The whole attempt to explain the strike as a "voluntary national movement," and to eulogise the action of the strikers as "an act of noble sacrifice" is nothing but a determined effort at dissemination of a black and a disgraceful lie with the direct object of throwing dust in the eyes of the unwary public.

It is quite clear that in continuing the strike the leaders had been actuated by motives of prestige alone. This is proved by Mr. C. R. Das' pronouncement at Rajbari on the 26th June, on his way back from East Bengal. Mr. C. R. Das urged the continuance of the strike as the steamer companies were not yielding to reasonable terms. He advised the strikers to go home and said that the strikes were receiving attention from the leaders. He promised that they would be supported. Mr. Das went on to add :—
"The honour of Bengal and the success of the non-co-operation movement must be saved and secured."
Can the Authorities concede?

The decision of the railway company to replace the whole of its subordinate and menial staff who joined the strike and persisted in remaining out in spite of warnings and notices to return rather than surrender to the strikers and the wire-pullers from

behind is the result of a policy that is being gradually forced upon all employers of labour in India ; for what is now happening is that whether the strikers have economic or other grievances or not, extremist politicians are making use of them for their own purposes. It has come to this, that a surrender to the strikers means a victory for the party of anarchy and disorder, and so whether the concern affected is a big railway corporation, or a municipality, or an engineering works, or merely individuals whose servants are being enticed away from them, it becomes one might almost say a solemn duty to fight a strike by every means possible, and to put up with temporary inconvenience and loss of money rather than to yield ground to politicians who will only make use of repeated weaknesses to launch further attacks upon society. The strike on the A. B. Ry. and on the River Steam Company's boats illustrates in a remarkable way the methods employed by the non-co-operators to make use of politics to interrupt communications and thereby bring us nearer to the anarchy they contemplate. The coolie movement afforded various leaders from Calcutta and Chittagong an opportunity to incite the strike. They assert now that they had nothing to do with sending the men out, and we have Mr. Das actually saying that his purpose in going to Chandpur was to find out why there was a strike, although he must have known, as everybody else who has followed events, that the strike was part of the Hartal proclamation by the Congress committees, and the initiation of which caused exceedingly great joy to Congress newspapers, who declared that it was further proof of the excellence of the Congress organisation. The fact that the strike deepened the miseries of the coolies in sympathy (?) with whom it was proclaimed did not affect the non-co-operation leaders at all. What was it to them that nearly a hundred coolies died of cholera at Chandpur, that many thousands of coolies were deprived of their living, that some hundreds of other employees, such as railwaymen and steamer khalasis, running staff and clerks were running the risk of being imminently

out of employment? The non-co-operation policy has sent up the prices over a large area of E. B. and Assam and seriously embarrassed if not ruined many tradespeople and merchants.

It will be admitted that most of the strikers belonged to the most ignorant classes and were misled. Further, by holding out against them and replacing them by other workers, the deluded ones will suffer instead of the real culprits. At the same time something must be done, and, because feeling is steadily hardening amongst the reputable classes in India, it is beginning to be asserted that the only way of checking the influence of the leaders amongst working men is by convincing them that the leaders are mischief-makers pure and simple and that their advice, if followed, always leads to misery and suffering. Once the workers have begun to contrast the palaces in which the agitators live and the luxurious motor cars in which they roll by with their own retinues with their own condition, they will realise that they are being befooled and made use of. On the other hand if the employers of labour give in to the demands made by the strikers at the instigation of wealthy "leaders," then labour will not discover for the time being that it is a pawn in the hands of unscrupulous politicians, and will be prepared in due course to make further extravagant demands: it will strike again and more generally, till we finally reach the stage for which the non-co-operators are working, and that is the general stoppage of all industrial and social activities.

The Congress and the strikes : Gross and dishonest misapplication of Swaraj funds.

As was naturally anticipated, a large number of railway employees have been dismissed from service and compelled to vacate railway quarters. Many of them have become homeless without any means of maintaining themselves and their families. The Congress committees almost all over E. B. and Assam have now identified the problem of these strikers with the Congress cause, although it is as clear as

daylight that the strike from the very beginning of its conception was directly opposed to the principles of Congress and to the injunctions of Mr. Gandhi in spite of all the sophisms of Deshabandhu Das to the contrary. What will the public therefore say of the following from Mr. C. R. Das ? :—

“The holy land of Chittagong has to-day earned the top-place in India by her demonstration of the effectiveness of the non-co-operation movement. It is in Chittagong that the non-violent war of non-co-operation has begun in real earnest—this war must be conducted with all the energy at our disposal—the nation's prestige must be preserved at all costs, even if all the Railway employees lose their appointments. The country will have to take charge of these brethren—all moneys that might be needed for the purpose will have to be found by Chittagong and other parts of Bengal. The funds of Tilak Swaraj Bhandar will have to be made available without stint for these heroic sons of Chittagong.”

The whole country is aware that the Swaraj Funds were never intended to be diverted for such purposes and that the declared objects of the said fund were clearly notified to the public when it was inaugurated. The use of Swaraj Funds therefore for such irregular objects, objects which are wholly against the principles and professions of the Congress, constitute a grave breach of public trust. This is another example of autocracy in the name of democracy, and illustrates how public money can be spent by irresponsible leaders against the original intentions of the donors and subscribers.

The whole country disgusted.

The whole country is by this time disgusted at the folly and perversity of this section of the extremists, but they seem to be wholly indifferent either to remonstrance or warning. Mr. Andrews addressing a Calcutta audience called upon all concerned to

take timely warning. He said:—

“The Day of Judgment has come for the educated leaders of the people of India also..... I speak sadly because I have been dealing with strike after strike during the last few months, which have brought very little but misery and starvation to the poor.....Even to-day, this steamship strike at Chandpur and Goalundo which was made against my utmost entreaty is going, I am afraid, to bring nothing but misery and suffering to the Assam labourers themselves..... Therefore I say most earnestly if you will bear with me, it will not do merely to excite the poor to strike. It will not do indiscriminately to use these strikes (in which the poor are the chief sufferers) as a weapon to bring Government to its knees.”

The growing cloud of popular disgust ultimately openly burst in the meeting of the Bengal Central Labour Federation in the Hall of the Indian Association on the 16th June, in which many prominent Nationalist speakers strongly condemned the leaders who organised the strike. Mr. Krishna Kumar Mitra said that those who had organised the strike were guilty of a great sin. The president Mr. Syam Sundar Chakravarti said he would emphatically assert and challenge that strikes did not form any part in the programme of non-co-operation. He then concluded his speech and said that by advocating strikes, etc., they were “murdering Gandhi.” And finally the disgust of the sober section of even the extremists took a concrete form of repudiation of the whole non-co-operation movement, as is testified by the following letter which Babu Kalidts Chatterjee wrote to the *Bengalee* :—

“I shall be much obliged by your kindly publishing the fact that I have just tendered my resignation of the appointment of Secretary to the South Calcutta Congress committee as well as my membership of the Indian National Service. I had been an ardent supporter of the non-co-operation movement from the very beginning and had preached its doctrines in all

parts of the country during the last few months even against the wishes of my friends and family members. But now I find that there is not the remotest chance of our achieving any political advancement by means of non-co-operation. I feel compelled to admit that hartals and strikes, such as the recent strikes of coolies and railwaymen in Eastern Bengal, serve merely to add to the crushing distress of our poorer countrymen and by fostering chaos and disorder render the attainment of Swaraj far more difficult than ever. Henceforth my watchword will be co-operation and co-operation alone."

CHAPTER XI.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE PUNJAB AFFAIRS.

The Martial Law Régime in the Punjab in 1919 which followed the horrors and outrages perpetrated by the people themselves has now become one of the principal pegs on which the non-co-operation agitation is kept hanging.

Every body in India, official and non-official, expressed deep regret that such an incident had to take place at all. But we cannot ignore the fact that the first provocation came from the popular side—that the spark was lit by the people themselves. They murdered innocent people in the most brutal way conceivable, burnt down property worth lakhs and lakhs of rupees, cut telegraph lines and railway connections, and perpetrated other outrages—and in inevitable course, reprisals followed. The Indian Government is no better and no worse than other governments. They may commit mistakes as do others. Men in difficult situations do not behave as they would in the calm of their office chairs. There were certainly riots by the people upon a dangerous scale accompanied by incidents which would not fail to provoke reprisals while order was being restored.

Is it not our duty as loyal subjects to throw a veil over this unpleasant affair by mutually forgiving and forgetting, as we have been solemnly asked to do by his august Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, as the representative of our Blessed Sovereign? Let us therefore sink all past unpleasantness in oblivion and march onwards with progressive steps consistent with peace and order to the Goal of Swaraj indicated in his Gracious Majesty's message to the people of India.

Nothing but harm can arise from senseless harping on the two-year-old incidents which can only contribute to keep the old sores open and increase race prejudice and lead to unhappy relationship between Indians and the British People. Nothing but mischief can arise from sustaining an agitation "for redress of the Punjab wrongs" by a repetition of the shibboleth that "the Punjab wrongs can only be righted and not be repeated when people get Swaraj and not before." But, Swaraj or no Swaraj, law, order and public tranquillity must be maintained, popular risings must be suppressed, and lives and property must be protected from the fury of the mob. There is no ground why this ancient memory should be perpetuated, unless the extremists want a peg on which to hang their propaganda of hate. One of the greatest Masters of Wisdom—Lord Buddha—said:—"Hatred does not cease at any time by hatred, hatred ceaseth by love."

We solemnly invite the attention of all our countrymen to the dignified debates on the Punjab Affairs in the first session of the Indian Legislative Assembly and the Council of State, where, after a lengthy discussion, the representatives of the people of India welcomed the Duke of Connaught's appeal to forgive and forget, resolved to let bygones be bygones and to sink the whole affair in oblivion. If, in addition to this, any further healing balm was at all necessary, then it has been provided by His Excellency Lord Reading in his reply to the deputation from the Liberal Association of the United Provinces:—

"You allude to the unhappy events in the Punjab of two years ago. The very regrettable mistakes and excesses committed on that occasion have been frankly admitted and deplored by official spokesmen and in official documents on more than one occasion. Let me quote only one passage from a speech by Sir William Vincent on behalf of the Government of India. The honourable member after recalling and condemning the wanton murders and crimes of violence that preceded the acts to which

you refer, said :—‘ On the other hand we have overdrastic and severe punishment, the excessive use of force and acts which have been interpreted, and I am afraid reasonably interpreted, as calculated to humiliate the Indian people in a manner which cannot but be regarded as unpardonably and morally indefensible at any time, but more so than ever at a time when this country was about to enter upon a system of responsible government.’

“ Mistakes have been admitted, regrets have been expressed, and the moving appeal was made to forgive and forget. I refrain from further discussion in order that I may follow this exhortation. I shall only add that we must use the past to gather wisdom, to guide us in the present and the future and to help us to a closer and a more sympathetic understanding of each other. As you know I am engaged at present upon the examination of the cases of persons still imprisoned in connection with these disorders, and I shall shortly announce my conclusions. Apart from that, I do not see what purpose can now be served by reviving this unhappy chapter of our history and I ask you and through you all Indians who believe in constitutional methods to endorse the view taken by the Legislative Assembly last February to let bygones be bygones and to regard this chapter as closed save for the lessons to be deducted for the guidance of the future.”

Let us therefore again repeat—forgive and forget—let us sink the memories of past bitterness into oblivion—let us join hands and work on to welcome the dawn of a brighter and glorious day.

CHAPTER XII.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS TURKISH AND KHILAFAT QUESTIONS.

The Khilafat question is also another of the pegs on which the non-co-operation agitation is kept hanging. Here also, as on other questions, the non-co-operators have introduced unnecessary political animus with no other purpose than to accentuate racial hatred and to discredit and embarrass the British Government—Imperial and Indian.

Non-Co-Operators' tactics:—Attitude of Extremist Musalmans.

One of the declared objects of the early days of Swaraj, according to Mr. Gandhi, Mahomed Ali and their followers, was that the Khilafat question could only be satisfactorily settled when India got Swaraj—that the Khilafat wrongs would be redressed only when Swaraj was established. But none of them has ever tried to explain how this miracle will come about! Why should a satisfactory decision of the Khilafat question be contingent on the establishment of Swaraj in India? Turkey and the Holy Places of the Mahomedan world are far from the Indian border. How then will it be possible for Mahatma Gandhi and his non-violent (?) followers to expel the Infidels from those places and re-establish absolute and independent Ottoman rule after the British withdraw from India or are compelled to leave India to herself!

There is one aspect of the question, which is responsible for the acute feeling among a certain section of the extreme wing of the Muslim Party. They look upon the Sultan of Turkey not only as their spiritual head but also as their temporal sovereign,

and as such they cannot tolerate any dismemberment of the old Turkish Empire or any punitive action against her.

Illustration of this attitude.

Every action against Turkey—however well deserved or provoked it might have been—is interpreted as a fresh onslaught on Islam itself. Only lately, we have seen the terrible outbursts of a section of the Extremist Press, some of the Extremist Khilafat leaders and particularly of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, President of the Calcutta Khilafat Committee regarding the Inter-Allied conversations with regard to the measures against the Angora Government, and the resolution passed on 19th June by the Belgaum district Khilafat conference “that they would declare an Indian Republic in consultation with the Congress if Great Britain directly, or through the Greeks, openly or secretly fought the Turkish Government of Angora.” The Moulana declared—

“If there is any brave and independent party in the world that has been fighting against the deadly enemies of Islam, and thus discharging alone the duties which devolve upon all the Mahomedans in the world, it is only the Kamelist party, and it would therefore be the bounden duty of all Muslims according to the Islamic Law to save them even at the cost of their own existence.” He desired to point out very clearly that if the British Government took any military expedition against the Kamelists it would again be renewing hostilities against Islam, and would create such a critical situation among the Indian Muslims as our proud and arrogant rulers could never have imagined. He meant to say that under such circumstances the Indian Muslims would be compelled, according to their religious commandments, **to review their present attitude and not to rely upon the non-co-operation movement only.**

He continued :—

“The Indian Muslims simply laugh at the diplomatic announcements of such made up news that the Kamelists’ conduct has been against the Islamic traditions, or that the British expedition will not be against Turkey but against the Kamelists alone, and so forth. The Muslims know fully well that at the present moment **there is only one government in the world, that is Turkish and Islamic, and that government is in Angora.**”

We have referred to this in order to expose the tactics used by an extremist section of the Muslim community to embarrass the British Government in the name of religion. These people are keeping up a wholly artificial agitation over some imaginary grievances which do not bear investigation, and which can do absolutely no good. On the other hand such artificial agitation is responsible for the perpetuation of unnecessary bitterness and race prejudice. These so-called patriots have overlooked the grave danger which such a propaganda of misrepresentation, exploiting the religious sentiments of the ignorant Mahomedan masses in India will lead to.

True facts, and sober, intelligent Muslim opinion and attitude :—

The Kamelists, headed by Mustapha Kamel Pasha, have cut themselves adrift from the Ottoman Empire and their allegiance to the Sultan of Turkey, and have been attempting to found and control a state of their own in Angora. There was undoubtedly a great deal of sympathy in England with the Kamelists in the beginning. But it has become an open secret now that the Angora government is for the present controlled by Bolsheviks. The Angora government tortured and put to death an Indian Musalman and it was Angora which first declared that a state of war existed. The Maulana admits that Mustapha Beg, a British subject, was put to death, but tries to explain that the said Mustapha

Beg was a spy and an informer. Therefore, to try and induce Indian Musalmans to believe that what are really punitive measures against Angora and the Russian Bolsheviki who control her, are measures against Islam is to be guilty of the very worst form of propaganda. However, the hope was not belied that educated Muslims in this country were fully aware of the exact facts and would be bound in the interests both of Islam and of India at large to proclaim the truth. In connection with the senseless and violent outbursts of the Maulana and others, a sober Mahomedan gentleman, with a true sense of responsibility, sent the following to the Press under the heading—"Irresponsibility of Moslem Leaders":

"I have carefully read the statement, dated June 8, issued to the press by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and if I have been able rightly to understand him he means to convey a somewhat veiled threat that the Indian Mahomedans may be provoked to a declaration of **Jehad** in case the British Government assumes a hostile attitude towards the government of Angora. In my humble opinion the learned Maulana, in rushing into print with such a statement, has not displayed the sense of responsibility which, as a professed leader of Indian Mahomedans it was his duty to exercise in the present situation. We have it on the authority of such men as Mr. Hassan Imam and even Dr. Ansari, who are not known to be in the habit of lavishing false praises on the British Government, that the Government of India has not been wholly negligent towards the sentiments of the Indian Mahomedans and has been constantly pressing their point of view. It would be the height of ingratitude as well as bad policy to be constantly flinging threats at the government under these circumstances and hereby alienating its sympathies.

"What is, however, still more dangerous is that the uneducated masses among the Mahomedans who value nothing more than religion

should be juggled with by means of religious formulas which they do not understand and be insensibly led to adopt a course which is likely to efface their existence without bettering their religion. We all still remember the glib preachings about **hijrat** which brought nothing but ruin and misery to those whose religious enthusiasm was so cruelly played upon by unpractical guides, that they did not stop to consider what a mad course they were adopting. And may we not ask whether **Jehad** on the part of Indian Mahomedans can be defended even on theological grounds? In the first place, India is Dar-ul-Aman (Land of Peace) and not Dar-ul-Harab (Land of War). In the second place, in spite of manifold misrepresentations on the subject there is no immediate danger to our Holy Places. Again, it is curious that **Jehad** should not be thought of so long as the Turks are fighting with and being opposed by the Greeks and other people; but the moment the British Government is opposed to them even on political grounds there should be talk of religious crusade. I think we Mahomedans who have a considerable stake in the country in which we are living for so many generations ought to have better guidance, and the learned Maulana would have been better advised to issue his warning against ill-timed fanatical outbursts and irresponsible leadership rather than against the British Government."

The Turkish Problems.

While expressing our deepest sympathy and support for Muslim religious opinion and sentiments, we are afraid we cannot express our whole-hearted support to Turkey and her territorial ambitions. We cannot overlook the fact that it was Turkey that first started hostilities against the British and her Allies in the great War, and that she, forgetting old friendship and obligations, joined the Germans—which act largely contributed to the unnecessary

prolongation of the war and consequent misery and hardship all over the world. May we pertinently ask, what would have been our fate, and that of many other countries, had Germany, Turkey and their Confederates been successful in the war? Turkey rushed headlong into the war of aggression and is it unfair to expect that she must bear the retribution of her folly?

Apart from these considerations, the treatment of subject peoples by Turkey has been found to be an unparalleled record of blackness and brutality, and therefore these unfortunate people require special protection. For the edification of those whom it may concern, we reproduce below Reuter's messages giving the summary of the trial of Talaat Pasha's murderer in Berlin:—

London, June 2.

“A Berlin message states that the trial of the young Armenian student Tellirian for shooting Talaat Pasha has opened.

London, June 2.

A Berlin message says that in his trial for the murder of Talaat Pasha, Tellirian repeatedly broke down and had to be soothed by the Judge as he graphically recounted details of the massacre of Armenians in 1915. His family, well-to-do tradespeople in Irinjan, were carried to Halt. Their belongings were plundered, Tellirian's mother and sisters were knocked down and violated and then all were slaughtered except the accused who was left on the ground unconscious. Subsequently he was in Berlin and saw his mother in a vision saying:—“Talaat is here, yet you are indifferent.” Later he saw Talaat and again saw his mother's vision. He seized his revolver and shot Talaat dead. Witnesses include Marshal Liman Von Sanders, German ex-Commander-in-Chief in Turkey and a number of well-known psychologists.

Berlin, June 3.

Tellirian, who has been on trial for the murder of Talaat Pasha, has been acquitted.

An Armenian witness described the massacres of the Armenians in 1915. He said that 1,000 Armenians were deported to the desert and massacred at short intervals en route. First of all 500 young people were bound together and thrown into the water and they the men were separated from women and their heads struck off with a hatchet.

The women were then violated and the wombs of the pregnant were ripped up, and the women who struggled against outrage were murdered.

A Professor confirmed these statements and stated that the Turks killed a million Armenians in a most cruel manner and 850,000 others died of hunger and exhaustion. The Professor declared that 200,000 Armenians in Constantinople, Smyrna and Aleppo were spared owing to the intervention of General von Sanders and the German Consul of Aleppo.

Von Sanders stated that the German officers in Turkey prevented massacres wherever possible ".....As a matter of fact, however, of all the belligerents, Turkey has been most leniently dealt with, largely out of deference to the religious sentiments of the Muslim World—the bulk of the Mahomedan population being subjects of the British and the French. It was a wholly secular war fought on purely political grounds and on a secular basis, and it is therefore illogical to introduce religious issues into the matter. Britain and her allies did not wage a war of aggression against the Turkish Empire and therefore they cannot stand charged with having spoiled the Khilafat.

A few words to non-co-operators and Swarajists :

Next, may we pertinently ask the exponents of Swaraj in India why the different subject peoples within the Turkish Empire should not aspire to their own independence? Is Swaraj the monopoly of only the extremist agitators? Should the Arabs

remain for ever under the Suzerainty of the Sultan of Turkey simply because for a number of centuries that country had the accident to hold the Hedjaz under her political sway ?

May we further ask the people who have in season and out of season been harping on the so-called Punjab wrongs whether they would support the sustenance of the Turkish yoke over the different people living within her empire—the absolute Turkish monarchy—knowing as they do of the most terrible atrocities which Turkey was guilty of, and in comparison with which other atrocities of history sink into insignificance ? What have the exponents of the cult of Non-Violent Non-Co-Operation to say in the matter ? Has not Mahatma Gandhi, among other grounds for not co-operating with the present British Government declared “we are violent when we sustain a government whose creed is violence” ? Would they break their vow—jeopardise their consciences—and go to support the Turks whose creed is equally violent or more so and who believe only in the sword ? Has not Mahamad Ali himself declared that Turkey is the sword of Islam ? How then can the supporters of non-violence support the sword ?

We however do not intend to belittle or flout Mahomedan religious sentiments, and the above remarks are merely intended by way of exposing the utter hollowness of the unholy agitation kept up by Mr. Gandhi, Mahamad Ali and their extremist followers.

The British Government and its attitude towards the Khilafat question.

We sincerely sympathise with sober Mohamedan sentiments and are anxious to see more favourable peace terms offered to Turkey and to see that our Muslim brothers' religious rights are properly safeguarded and respected. All impartial people must give credit to the Government of India and the Imperial British Government for absolute sincerity.

They have been throughout upholding the Muslim cause with all the earnestness they are capable of.

The Turkish peace terms were not however a matter in which the Government of India or even the Imperial British Government had or have the final word : and in this connection we cannot help pointing out that Indian Muslim sentiment is counting much more in the final reckoning than would have been conceivable had India not been a part of the British Empire ? It is therefore senseless to make this subject a ground for agitation on "Swaraj" platforms and in the press.

Mr. Hassan Imam, who recently returned from Europe on the completion of his labours as a member of the Muslim Delegation to the Peace Conference, stated—

".....During my stay in London I gathered from the Turkish Delegates that they were not keen on getting Palestine, Mesopotamia, Syria and Hedjaz. All they wanted was that they should be left to develop themselves free from outside control and interference, in their homelands of Asia Minor, Constantinople and Thrace.....

".....The attitude of the Indian Government in regard to the Khilafat question is as deferential towards the sentiments of the Indian Mahomedans now as it was in the time of Lord Chelmsford. Lord Reading and his government are doing their best to attain for Indian Mahomedans what the latter want, but if all that is wanted is not given it will not be because of any lack of endeavour on the part of the present Viceroy and his government. As I have said on another occasion the Prime Minister may himself suffer from limitations, but I do believe that he is anxious to treat the Indian Moslem representation with sympathy".

What more can even the Muslim Extremists expect the British Government to do ? Does not the attitude of these Extremists in keeping up a violent Khilafat agitation under the garb of non-co-opera-

tion disclose gross ingratitude on their part towards the Government of India and the Imperial British Government who are so nobly upholding the cause of the Muslims ?

CHAPTER XIII.

**PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL DEFENCE AND
NON-CO-OPERATION
MENTALITY.**

The maintenance of internal tranquillity and the preservation of the country from external invasion are the supreme duties of all Government, and the present non-co-operation cult is openly attempting to make this impossible. We have exposed how Mr. Gandhi and his lieutenants have been openly preaching that it is not the duty of any non-co-operator to assist the present government with men and money in its fight with foreign enemies, even if they invade India. Mr. Gandhi had the self-complacency to go so far as to say before a meeting at Bombay in the middle of June—"Even supposing that the British left them altogether, they had not to be afraid of anybody. If they lived peacefully, neither Afghanistan, Persia nor Japan would invade India. But he was not sure of Japan, but even if she did invade India they (the Indians) would treat her in the same way as they treated the British": *i.e.* there will be waged another war of non-violent non-co-operation against them, and this will go on ad infinitum till all avaricious nations get disgusted of India and resolve to leave her alone!!!

Can bluff and nonsense go any further?

Have the people realised what will be the result of such a cult? Do not such irresponsible speeches and writings constitute open encouragement to the enemies of the British Government to concert plans of attack on India on the one hand, and on the other hand encourage the rowdy criminal and unprincipled section of the people within to defy

and break the law openly and with impunity (as some have already commenced to do), causing serious breaches of public tranquillity?

Special menace to the N.-W. and N.-E. Frontier Provinces.

Assam particularly ought to have very painful recollections as to what a foreign invasion, particularly by a semi-barbaric people means. The Assamese have not yet forgotten the terrible atrocities during the Burmese invasions. Who would protect the peaceful people of the plains from attacks accompanied with arson, loot, murders and rape by the surrounding Hill Tribes—Bhutias, Dafflas, Miris, Mishmis, Abors, Nagas—if the present government with its full paraphernalia of Police and Sepoys are paralysed as they hope they will be? Will the passive practice of “soul force” have any effect on these people? What will be the fate of the people in the Punjab and her surrounding countries if the semi-civilised hordes across the borders are let loose? Shall not the children of the soil be the worst sufferers?

In this connection we cannot ignore the facts regarding Bolshevism in India.

The immediate and indirect danger from the N.C. cult.

That the steps taken by Afghanistan two years ago were engineered by Bolsheviks is certain, and they have their ideals no less than the extremists in India. An Afghanistan measuring her strength with Britain in India reveals her potentialities and power to scheming Bolsheviks.

Non-co-operators by accepting a so-called doctrine of absolute non-violence in this instance have been trying to undermine the very foundation of law and order, and to entice people to stand aloof from the most primary duty of citizens, *viz.*, that of co-operation with the Government for the maintenance of internal and external peace and safety. The propaganda, if successful, is sure to lead the country headlong into chaos and disorder.

Psychology of non-co-operation mentality.

What is the secret of this mentality, which Gandhi, Mahamad Ali, Lajpat Rai and their gang have developed? A mentality which can regard with complacency an invasion of the motherland by brutal and semi-civilised guerilla warriors? The whole psychology of the non-co-operation party depends upon distrust of the present government—a distrust for which they have only themselves to blame. The problem therefore which concerns this party is how to relieve India of the incubus of British Rule which threatens to crush her. It is plain, so they say, that so long as Indians remain weak, disorganised and unarmed, the British can hold the country indefinitely by force of arms. It is not impossible, some of them may think, to expel the British. The only possible expedient is to call in outside help. That such intervention may be accompanied by anarchy is likely. But if inevitable this anarchy must be faced, for from it freedom will spring. Hence it is that the mentality of the non-co-operation party logically leads them to bend their energies towards the creation of such a hatred of British Rule on the part of the Indian masses that this rule shall be undermined and rendered unstable.

CHAPTER XIV.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND BOLSHEVISM.

It is widely known that the Bolsheviks have their own schemes about India, that they have an eye on this vast continent, and the Non-co-operation movement is directly facilitating the Bolshevik propaganda by creating an atmosphere of unsettled unrest. Mr. Gandhi openly declared some time ago that he would rather welcome Bolshevism in India than tolerate the existing Government any longer. Some of his followers also repeat the same opinion. Have the people ever realised what the conquest of India by Bolshevism will mean? If Bolshevism prevails the vaunted spirituality of India will be swept away and the hoary culture and the Civilisation of ancient India will be lost beyond redemption.

Bolshevism seems to have appealed to some of the extremist leaders and captured the fancy of young people by its novelty. The sentiment has also been openly aired in many quarters that the people in Russia are now all living under an ideal system of government, that all are equally happy under this heavenly system, and that the accounts which appeared in English and other papers from time to time of Bolshevik oppression and tyranny were the results of determined efforts to discredit the movement and to prevent the spread of Bolshevik ideas and ideals in India. But real truth cannot long be hid and overwhelming and unimpeachable evidence of Bolshevik horrors began to accumulate steadily with the result that humanity has been staggered at Bolshevik perpetrations. They have in Russia established a reign of terror and a type of tyranny and oppression in comparison with which Tzardom at its worst was an immense blessing. In the name of Bolshevism, various outrages are being perpetrated not only upon men

but upon women and children. Bolsheviks have everywhere been proving themselves enemies of God and Religion. Religious societies in Russia and elsewhere, where Bolshevism is in full swing, have been forcibly suppressed. Such societies were offered liberty if they would spread among the populace the teaching that not only was there no God, but that religion was the primary cause of ignorance and injustice and therefore the maker of revolutions and wretchedness. The societies which boldly refused to preach this propaganda were suppressed and the members subjected to gross insults and violence.

This accumulation of evidence however did not create any impression on a section of the extremists who continued to express open sympathy with the Bolshevik cult. In some quarters the matter has gone so far that sentiments have been freely expressed that if the people fail to extort Swaraj from the present Bureaucracy, the people of India will themselves become Bolshevik or allies of the Bolsheviks. Bolshevism has therefore become a source of menace to peace and order in India. The non-co-operation movement in its present form is an open invitation to Bolshevik intrigues and it is therefore necessary to counteract the movement for the best interests of this country.

Lately, Dr. Ansari, one of the prominent Khilafat leaders and a congressman, made a long statement exposing certain aspects of Bolshevism in its nakedness. These exposures have been summarised as follows by a writer to the Press:—

“Dr. Ansari has done a great service to the cause of Islam by exposing Bolshevism in its true colours, and by his detailed description of the inhuman horrors perpetrated by Bolsheviks in Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, Khiva and Bokhara. In the beginning Bolshevism seemed to appeal to Indian Muslims, what with its appeals to equality and brotherhood, and accordingly whenever faithful accounts appeared in English papers, of Bolshevik oppression and tyranny, they were generally received with a lot

of suspicion in this country, and attributed largely to the resourceful imagination of the Indian Publicity Department. But truth cannot be long hid or suppressed, and at last Bolshevism stands revealed to-day in all its naked colours. Its contempt for Islam and its ill-treatment of Islamic spiritual leaders are to-day admitted facts, and Dr. Ansari's unimpeachable testimony has only served to confirm the general belief in the public mind. The inhumanity of compulsorily unveiling women in the streets, has naturally caused untold hatred and resentment against Bolsheviks among the Muslim population of Bokhara, and the many refugees that are daily filtering into Peshawar from Turkestan bring fresh and indescribable stories of Bolshevik oppression. In view of the sympathy with which Bolsheviks and their programme were originally viewed in this country, it is the duty of every public man to condemn most emphatically the Bolsheviks and their methods of action, and to create the strongest feeling of resentment against them in the public mind, so that their insidious doctrines may not take root and fructify in this country. Bolshevism is a standing menace to Islam just as it is to every civilisation based on humanising religion, and the collective effort of mankind is urgently needed to extirpate and root out the growth of this poisonous plant in the garden of the world."

How shall we therefore describe the mentality of these non-co-operators who can speak so lightly of and express open sympathy with such a satanic cult and can think with equanimity of an invasion of India by Bolshevik hordes?

CHAPTER XV.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE AFGHAN MUDDLE.

In May 1921, Mr. Gandhi published the following apologia in his organ "Young India"—

"Is not my article on the Afghan Bogey the invitation to the Afghans to invade the Indian border and thus do I not become a direct party to violence? Thus asks Mr. Andrews. My article was written for the Indians and for the government. I do not believe the Afghans to be so foolish as to invade India on the strength of my article; **But I see that it is capable of bearing the interpretation put upon it by Mr. Andrews.** I therefore hasten to inform all whom it may concern that not only do I not want to invite the Afghans or anybody to come to our assistance, but I am anxious for them not to come to our assistance. I am quite confident of India's ability to settle with the government without extraneous help. I am interested in demonstrating the perfect possibility of attaining our end only by non-violent means. I should therefore strain every nerve to keep the Afghans out of the Indian border, **but my anxiety to keep them off the Indian border will not go so far as to assist the government with men and money.**"

Let us proceed and see what led the Mahatmaji to eat his own words and to publish this halting explanation.

Since some time, it had become the fashion among the non-co-operation and Khilafat leaders, such as Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Lajpat Rai, and the Ali Brothers to express views and air sentiments the clear effect of which was to encourage an Afghan invasion of India.

A strong rumour was afloat for some time to the effect that Mahamad Ali and other extremists of his type had been engaged in an intrigue with the Afghans for an invasion of India to assist in the overthrow of the British Government and to establish Swaraj. It even came to light that an Afghan spy came to visit some of the Indian leaders, including Pandit Malaviya, to ascertain their views regarding an Afghan invasion of the Indian frontier.

The recent speeches of Mr. Gandhi, Mahamad Ali and some of the lesser fry had so thoroughly alarmed many of the Hindu extremists that they threatened to put an end to the much advertised alliance between the Congress and the Moslem League. When therefore the Ali Brothers, Mr. Gandhi, Lala Lajpat Rai and other prominent leaders from different parts of India happened to be at Allahabad in connection with the District Conference there, Dr. Kitchlew interviewed Mr. Ali, Swami Shraddhanand, and Mr. Gandhi probably with the intention of trying to get them to say something which would reassure those Swarajists who were afraid that the expulsion of the British would be followed by a Moslem domination controlled by Afghanistan or Turkey. But beyond denying the story about the visit of the Afghan spy and that they had been engaged in any intrigue with the Afghans, the leaders would hardly budge from the position they had taken up. A report of these interviews was published at length in the "Independent," the organ of extremism at Allahabad and was telegraphed at considerable length to the press in other parts of India on May 10, 1921. Beyond declaring that the story of the Afghan spy was a "bogey" and a "hare", these leaders did not make any reassuring statement to clear the atmosphere.

The story of the Afghan spy is true and not a "bogey."

- That the story of the Afghan spy was not wholly an invention to discredit Mahamad Ali and his gang will be borne out by full details of a statement issued

by Pandit Malaviya to the Simla representative of the Associated Press, and telegraphed to the Press on May 14. We quote below the pertinent extract from it—

“.....The facts are these: About a year ago, I think it was a little before the Khilafat Conference met at Allahabad, an Afghan came to me at Benares. He said he had been sent by some leading persons from Afghanistan, that the Amir Sahib and the leading men of Afghanistan were watching our fight with the British Government closely and deeply sympathised with us, and the Afghans were willing to come to India to help us against the British Government, but that they wanted to know whether, and how far in my opinion, the Hindus of this country would support the Afghans if they came to fight the British Government. I felt a doubt as to whether the man was a genuine messenger from Afghanistan or a spy sent by somebody here to draw me out....”

That this spy was not sent by “somebody here” will be borne out by the Press Communiqué published on 3rd June from Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, President of the Khilafat Committee. He stated therein—

“Regarding the Afghan “bogey”, the Maulana thinks that the man who saw Pandit Malaviya at Benares was not from Kabul but from India itself and was sent by Maulavi Niamatulla, the chief of the Old Indian Muhajirins of Bunair in the N.-W. Frontier. The Maulana says that in March 1920, this man saw him too in Bombay when he (Maulana) was there for the congress and Khilafat conference just after his release from internment. The man was posing as coming from Kabul simply to attach an undue importance to his position, but in fact he had no connection with the Kabul Darbar. He expressed his desire to be introduced to the late Mr. Tilak, Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Lala

Harkissen Lal, but then he (Maulana) did not think the matter to be of any attention and told the man that it was simply useless and nonsense. The Maulana thinks that the same man has been to Pandit Malaviya too in Benares. The Ali Brothers knew nothing about it nor he (Maulana) thought it was necessary to relate the incident to Mahatma Gandhi".

Comment on the above is wholly unnecessary.

Non-co-operators will not assist in warding off Afghan invasion.

The interviews published in the "Independent" therefore had no reassuring effect on the general public, and the atmosphere was allowed to remain cloudy by further statements made by Extremist leaders, both on the platform and in the press.

Mahamad Ali stated—"If the Amir of Afghanistan fights the enemies of Islam, he would have my entire support. If he fights the present government in India, because they are turbulent neighbours, he has my entire sympathy, and **he can free Afghanistan from fear by the liberation of India.**" Mahamad Ali further said on May 11, from his presidential chair in the Allahabad District Conference—"They wanted to win Swaraj but not with the aid of a Foreign power. But if any Foreign Power waged war against the present government for the purpose of making India free, they would not render any help to the government but would simply watch the fight and take no part in it, because they did not believe in violence."

Lala Lajpat Rai, speaking in the same conference also contended that as long as there was no Swaraj, and no atonement for the Punjab wrongs, they ought not to help the government in any way, even to ward off the Afghan "bogey."

It may be pointed out that Mr. Gandhi was present in this conference as an honoured visitor and was presented with an address of welcome by Pandit Motilal Nehru on behalf of the people of Allahabad.

Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, in his Press Communiqué, dated 3rd June, 1921, threw light in Mahammad Ali's veiled reference to "the enemies of Islam. The Maulana stated—

"The present circumstance is one under which the British Government is ruling over us against our will and holding us as slaves. In this case, any attack directed against India will not be against our country and ourselves but the British Government, and as that government has established its rule over the Islamic countries and is fighting against the Khilafat, no Mahomedan under any Islamic Law has any obligation to side with it."

If "Mahatma" Gandhi cannot control the publication of this sort of rubbish under his very nose, it is high time that he should fulfil his promise to give up his agitation and betake himself, as he threatened to do, to a life of solitary meditation in the woods!

These and other similar statements aired with impunity at last compelled Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal to break silence, and he sent the following letter to the Press which we quote in extenso—

"I am not allowed to read newspapers regularly, much less to discuss exciting political topics. But I cannot help raising a voice of warning, with all the emphasis that I can command, against the suicidal view which, I find, has been expressed by Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Lajpat Rai, that in the event of a foreign invasion, we must, in obedience to the Nagpur Resolution on Non-co-operation, refuse our help to the present government in the country."

"I have been a non-co-operator, in my humble way all my life. While unable to accept Mr. Gandhi's programme, even last year, I pleaded with all my strength for the principle and policy of non-co-operation as our "only weapon" and "last chance." Though I opposed Mr. Gandhi's Calcutta resolution, when it was modified at Nagpur, I openly lent my support to it. But if the interpretation put upon it by Mr. Lajpat Rai be correct, then I think it is the

clear duty of all those who desire real freedom in India to fight this idea with all their might and resources."

In my humble way I have also supported the present Khilafat movement, first because, as a Hindu, I hold that every religion is true and ordained by God, and we therefore cannot be indifferent to any insult or injury that may be offered to Islam any more than we can be in the case of similar insults or injuries that may be offered to our own religion; and secondly, the spoilation of the Khilafat is a serious menace to the freedom and integrity of Asia in general, and of India in particular. But I have never been able to appreciate the ideals and ambitions of what may be best described as political Pan-Islamism; and have always looked upon this Pan-Islamism as a general menace to Indian Nationalism. And my suspicion that Mr. Gandhi was possibly playing into the hands of our Pan-Islamist friends, prompted my opposition to his programme last year. This suspicion has been very much deepened by his last pronouncement on the Afghan "Bogey."

"I quite recognise that Mr. Gandhi does not believe in the possibility of an Afghan invasion; and he evidently thinks that a little flirting with Moslem sentiments would do no harm. He dismisses the whole thing as a "Bogey." But though "Bogeys" have no realities behind them, the psychological conditions created by them are not unreal and may very seriously affect the fate of those who are frightened by these "bogeys." And we are concerned here not with the reality or unreality of this Afghan menace, but with the mentality of our own people which the idea or rumour of it may create."

"I take it that Mr. Gandhi knows the present temper of his people. I think he knows it that in the event of an Afghan invasion, or even the mere circulation of a rumour of such an invasion, it will incite a very large part of our Moslem population to lawlessness, if not to open revolt. I take it he knows it that the feeling among the Hindus also is so bitter and that they have been driven to such a state of despara-

tion, that a very large proportion of them also will, in the event of a general Moslem rising, join them, just for a change, or in the hope (which is undoubtedly cherished by even intelligent and educated people), of settling their own account with the Mahommedans after they have got rid of the present foreign Bureaucracy. And what will happen then?"

"Can Mr. Gandhi deny that there are foolish people in the country, Moslems and Hindus both, and they are not really ignorant and uneducated, who would really welcome the Afghan or anybody else at this juncture? Can he deny that the presence of this mentality in the people constitutes a very grave danger to his own movement of non-violent non-co-operation itself? Yet, these utterances of his are calculated to help this very fatal mentality."

"If by any chance the Aghans should be encouraged to measure lances with the present British Government in India, and we cannot entirely ignore it that there are forces which may egg them on to this folly—there will be bound to be very serious trouble inside our own borders. And the surging wave of popular unrest will throw the present policy and principle of non-violence—which is hardly understood by Mr. Gandhi himself and a very small and selected band of his loyal lieutenants,—and not all who cry "Lord, Lord" will stand by him if there should be a general revolt or revolution in the land—to the winds."

"This revolt or revolution will either succeed or it will fail. If it succeeds, we shall have no Swaraj in India, but once more a Moslem-Raj at Delhi. Are we willing to risk our all upon this chance? If it fails, as it is sure to do, humanly speaking, the result will be still more disastrous. It will set back the course of Indian freedom fifty if not a hundred years. In either case, the pursuit of Mr. Gandhi's policy of refusing help to the present government in the event of an Afghan invasion will be suicidal to the cause of true Swaraj in India. If this be the meaning or implication of Mr. Gandhi's non-co-operation policy and programme, then, serious people must furiously think

what their position must be in regard to it. But this does not necessarily mean that the country should go back upon the general principle and policy of non-co-operation; but only this that the movement should not be permitted to frustrate the very object, namely, the advance of real freedom in India, which it has in view. It will be suicidal folly to sacrifice the end to the fetish of a mere means."

"In any case, those who care for real national freedom, and are not simply out to destroy the present British government, and leave the fate and future of the long suffering masses of the country upon the knees of the gods, or in the hands of unscrupulous adventurers,—must not hesitate to fight this evil mentality which would practically welcome an outside invader and help him to take the place of the present political authority in the country. Our quarrel is with the British Bureaucracy. And we shall fight this Bureaucracy to the bitterest end, until we secure our legitimate right of self-government. But we cannot, and shall not, unless we become insane, call in an outsider, to fight this Bureaucracy for us. He will not part with what he may wrest from the hands of this Bureaucracy, for our benefit. Are we going to repeat the history of the genesis of the present foreign régime over again? Have we, at least in Bengal, forgotten the folly of the Bengalee conspirators, who called in Clive to help them in their quarrel with Serajudowla?"

"P.S.—I find that both Mahatma Gandhi and Lala Lajpat Rai have gone back upon their earlier utterances and have, in their speeches at Simla, expressed their determination to fight all outside invaders. But something more consistent and well considered than these random and wild expressions of opinion is expected from popular leaders upon whose lips thousands of their countrymen hang for the formulation of their political principles and for practical guidance."

Although we do not agree with Mr. Pal in all the ideas and sentiments expressed by him, yet we have taken the liberty to quote the whole letter with the

object of showing the acute mentality of some of the intelligent agitators and what danger and menace are hidden in the impracticable doctrine of non-co-operation set loose among the uneducated and unintelligent people who have neither the intelligence to understand its principles nor the morality to practise it.

When the whole muddle was ripe, Mahatmaji thought fit to publish the belated halting apologia which we have quoted at the beginning of this chapter and which was telegraphed from Bombay on the 19th May. But even this communiqué leaves the main issue untouched and does not clear the atmosphere.

We thus find that the leaders of the extremist gang have done nothing but hedge and this fills honest citizens with wonder and dismay. Mahamad Ali will not even commit himself to the proposition, which seems to us self-evident, that the interests of the Motherland come before the interests of his particular community!

Probable result of this cult.

It is all very well for Mahamad Ali and even for the Mahatmaji to speak so calmly of an invasion, and to make light of its prospects. They are leaders, and will doubtless be safe. Mr. Mahamad Ali in particular has all to gain and nothing to lose. But we ordinary people must suffer whatever happens. If the Pan-Islamists triumph—for it is sheer camouflage to talk as if Afghanistan only is involved—then our lot will be even worse than it is now. Mr. Mahamad Ali complains that he is hindered from practising his religion. We suppose he means he is not allowed to prevent other people from practising theirs, for there is no other restraint placed upon him. Well, a successful invasion—and our history can show many such—will enable him to fulfil his desire. But if the invasion is repelled, what shall we Indians—Hindus or Musalmans—gain but blood and tears? We will have to pay the bill, and to support the crushing burden of added taxation to meet the heavy expenditure consequent on such an invasion. Why cannot

Mr. Gandhi, Mahamad Ali, Lajput Rai and people of their ilk say straight out like men that they desire the Amir to leave India alone, and that Muslims and Hindus both will resist to the last any violation of the sacred soil of India. That India will work out her own salvation, and woe to the power, Muslim or non-Muslim, that dares to interfere, whether on religious or political grounds. It however does not suit the convenience of the agitators to do so in view of the patched up alliance between the Congress (which is a wholly political body) and the All-India Khilafat Committee (which is wholly based upon so-called religious considerations). The Gandhi-cult or the Congress-cult without the Khilafat will not make the slightest impression on the Mahomedan masses in India.

CHAPTER XVI.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND THE ALI BROTHERS' CREED.

This question has become an important factor in discussing the future of the non-co-operation movement in view of the present truce between Mr. Gandhi representing the Non-co-operators and Swarajists and the Ali Brothers representing the Extreme Khilafatists.

Messrs. Mahamad Ali and Shaukat Ali issued the following apology and undertaking to the Press, the public and the Government in the last week of May 1921:—

“ Friends have drawn our attention to certain speeches of ours which in their opinion have a tendency to incite to violence. We desire to state that we never intended to incite to violence and we never imagined that any passages in our speeches were capable of bearing the interpretation put upon them, but we recognise the force of our friends' argument and interpretation. We sincerely feel sorry and express our regret for the unnecessary heat of some of the passages in these speeches and we give our public assurance and promise to all who may require it, that so long as we are associated with the movement of non-co-operation we shall not directly or indirectly advocate violence at present or in the future nor create an atmosphere of preparedness for violence. Indeed we hold it contrary to the spirit of Non-violent Non-co-operation to which we have pledged our word.”

The public are doubtless aware that this statement by the brothers was issued owing to the direct intervention of Mr. Gandhi and that it was the immediate result of the interview which Mr. Gandhi had

with the Viceroy during the middle of May. The immediate effect of this apology was the abandonment by the Government of India of the contemplated criminal prosecution of the Ali Brothers for direct incitement to violence.

Writing in "Young India" on the Ali Brothers' apology, Mr. Gandhi said that as soon as he saw passages of their speeches, he felt that they sounded harsh and seemed to be capable of being interpreted to mean incitement to violence. Hence his advice to the brothers to explain their animosity, which they had done. He reiterated his belief in the Ali Brothers' honesty, frankness, courage and humility and said that by their apology they had raised the tone and prestige of the Khilafat struggle.

But in spite of the above assurance by Mr. Gandhi, the public, and specially the Hindu public, cannot be so very readily reassured. Any careful reader will observe for himself that the Ali Brothers followed expediency and *not* principle in their present acceptance of the "non-violent non-co-operation" cult, and that their undertaking that "they shall not directly or indirectly advocate violence at present or in the future nor create an atmosphere of preparedness for violence" holds good **"so long as they are associated with the movement of non-co-operation."** There is a tremendous implication in this conditional apology which may escape the sight of superficial readers, and so we do not make any apology for discussing the true mentality and creed of the Ali Brothers. This has become more necessary, as Mahamad Ali, speaking in the Gujerat Khilafat conference at Broach, only a week after the publication of the apology, attempted to explain his conduct and took this advantage to make another violent attack on the government of India.

Mr. Gandhi and the Ali Brothers.

The alliance between Gandhi and the Ali Brothers is very strange. He is a devout Hindu, whereas they are staunch Mahomedans: he is a vegetarian and they are meat-eaters: he condemns all violence, whereas

they believe in the sword. It is an intricate problem. How is the fundamental antagonism between Hindu and Mahomedan outlook upon life to be permanently overcome, even supposing that common cause, and we ought to add a common enmity for the British people and the present government of India, hold Hindus and Mahomedans together as never before. More than eight months ago, Sir Valentine Chirol, writing in the "London Times" of an interview he had with Mr. Gandhi at which Shaukat Ali was also present, said—

"I wondered, as I withdrew, how long that particular Mahomedan would keep his sword unsheathed. Even now did he not feel that his own personality, or that of his brother Mahamad Ali, would count for very little without the reflected halo with which the saintliness of Mr. Gandhi's own simple and austere life, so different in every way from their own, has at least temporarily invested them?"

This much must, indeed, be said to Mr. Gandhi's credit that his constant reproof of violence, though, as we know from last year's experience, not always effective, has probably done not a little to restrain his Mahomedan allies from giving a free rein to the turbulent proclivities of a large section of the Mahomedan masses behind them.

Mahamad Ali's Erode speech.

The following was reported by the Associated Press from Madras on April 11th, 1921 :—

"At the Madras Presidency Muslim Volunteers' Conference at Erode on April 5th with Mahamad Ali in the chair, the latter is reported to have said that he differed from Mr. Gandhi in that he favoured violence. He was giving the Government one more chance of redressing the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs, but these wrongs could only be righted, and never be repeated by the granting of Swaraj. It would be a shame for the crores of Indians to fight a handful of Englishmen and that was what deterred him from advocating violence. As a Mussalman he would not flinch from

adopting methods of violence, but in as much as they were now practising non-violent non-co-operation he would not recommend violent methods."

One resolution passed by the meeting asked the All-India Khilafat Committee to organise an All-India Volunteer Corps. Later in the day Mahamad Ali addressed a public meeting, saying that the English did not bring any forces with them when they first landed in India. They came in like thieves and they should send the thief out by the same aperture through which he entered their house. Indians at that time co-operated with the English and non-co-operated with their own countrymen. Now it is their turn to non-co-operate with the English and co-operate with their own countrymen. In the siege of Arcot, Madras sepoy, to help 200 British soldiers, gave up their rice and drank conjee water. Now Indians were not prepared to give the English even water. The Indian Nation wanted, for the success of their cause, men, money and munitions. A crore of rupees, and a crore of members for the congress were needed within the next three months. They should approach Indian Troops, the Indian Police and the Indian Civil Service and draw them out.

Further professions and performances:—

Following his Madras speeches, Mahamad Ali made the following statement in Allahabad in May—

"....while violence is permissible in Islam it does not permit the Faithful to throw away a single life unnecessarily. I will also add that I shall continue to safeguard the interests of my country and its liberty against all comers, Muslim or non-Muslim. If, for instance, any Muslim power proclaimed **Jehad** and having defeated the present Government, wanted to settle down in India as its rulers, it will be my duty to oust such rulers from India, using every means allowed by my faith. I am a Muslim first any everything else afterwards, just as I believe that Mahatma Gandhi is a Hindu first and every

thing else afterwards. All that Islam demands from me is that I should not live in a land where I could not follow the dictates of my religion with impunity, and it is just because Swaraj will give me that and the present British Bureaucracy does not I yearn for Swaraj and regard its attainment as a religious dutyIf 20 crores of Hindus cannot liberate India without foreign help I hope and trust that 7 crores of Musalmans can and will. If the Amir of Afghanistan fights the enemies of Islam he would have my entire support. If he fights the present Government of India because they are turbulent neighbours he has my entire sympathy and he can free Afghanistan from fear by the liberation of India....."

Pan-Islamism vs. Indian Nationalism: Probable effect of Mahamad Ali's cult.

Many believed and cherished the hope that the opinions to which Mahamad Ali gave such frank expression in his speeches might perhaps prove untenable in view of the natural apprehension that they excited among the Hindu community. But we have searched in vain to discover anything from which the community can derive the slightest comfort. The extreme skill with which he evades answering the all important question as to the attitude of that section of the Indian Musalmans for which he speaks, towards an Afghan invasion, fills us with wonder and dismay. Mahamad Ali will not even commit himself to the proposition, which seems to us self-evident, that the interests of the motherland come before the interests of his particular community. Let us ask him what would have been the position of that community to-day, what would have become of the non-co-operation movement itself, if the Hindus had not nobly sunk their cherished prejudices in favour of what they considered their duty to India? We look in vain throughout Mahamad Ali's vapourings for any recognition of the duty he owes to the Hindus, who have stood by his community at so much cost to them-

selves. He would not even commit himself to joining them against an Afghan invasion. No, under the most favourable circumstances, he graciously consents to stand aside, presumably to watch the misery and suffering that such an invasion would bring—upon whom? Not upon the Government but upon the unfortunate Hindu Masses. For let us be under no delusion. If the forces of Afghanistan invade this country, they will proclaim a **jehad**. Those in charge of Afghan policy, those that direct the politics of Islam from Constantinople to Kabul, are not simpletons. Be their motive what it may they will certainly proclaim a **jehad**. Why should they deprive themselves of the help of seven crores of their co-religionists in India by saying that they are waging a war of aggression? Does not the Amir himself do everything under the name of religion? **And if a jehad is proclaimed, how will the Hindus fare?** They will fare as they have always fared in the past. They will be trodden under the feet of the brutal barbarians of Central Asia if the invasion succeeds, and they will have to support a crushing burden of taxation if the invasion fails!

The statement "I am a Muslim first and every thing else afterwards" discloses the real mentality of the Ali Brothers in its nakedness. If these words be added to the claim of the Khilafat people that the Sultan of Turkey is their temporal as well as their spiritual sovereign, then it is quite clear that it is impossible for Mr. Mahamad Ali and his followers to give their allegiance to any form of government in India which is not entirely Muslim, and to them Swaraj must mean an India which is under the control of the Khalifa. How in the face of this can there be any real understanding between the Congress and the Khilafat committee? It has not escaped the notice of Congressmen that though the Moslem Extremists profess to have the same ideals and the same policy as the Hindu Extremists, they are everywhere in India forming their own independent organisations. Why? It is Mr. Mahamad Ali who supplies the answer. It is because these extremists are Moslem

first and Indians afterwards. While the Hindu Swarajist talks of the "motherland" and draws his inspiration from India, Mr. Ali talks of Islam, and draws his inspiration sometimes from Kabul and sometimes from Roum.

CHAPTER XVII.

NON-CO-OPERATION AND HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY.

The subject of Hindu-Muslim unity is a problem which is dear to the heart of every true patriot and well-wisher of India. He would go a step further and aim at the ideal of a living brotherhood of the different communities living in India, nay in the world, irrespective of religion, race, creed, caste or colour. But a unity constituting true brotherhood must be sealed at the altar of morality and spirituality and not at the altar of simple political expediency. Unity, to become the foundation of an enduring brotherhood, must be built up on the solid foundation of mutual love, trust, sympathy, help, brotherly love and selflessness. No alliance for a common enmity can be enduring or take the place of the former.

If we critically examine the present alliance between the Congress and the Khilafat, we shall find that this so-called unity is based upon common enmity, and as such, cannot be for lasting good, being divested of the necessary moral conditions for an enduring unity of brotherhood.

It is far from our desire to make light of the momentous question of Hindu-Moslem unity, but lest we may be charged with being alarmists and carping critics, we venture to draw attention to the series of articles by Lala Lajpat Rai in his organ "Bande Mataram" published during May last.

The second article of this series dealt with the relations of Muslims towards the Hindus in India. After remarking that the present condition to which the Muslims in India and elsewhere have been reduced is due to the wrong policy of the Indian Muslims in trying to win the favour of a foreign government in India for communal representation and other

concessions which an Imperial nation could concede in its own interests, he says "the situation can only be redeemed by a firm and honest friendship of the Mahomedans and the Hindus which will liberate India from the foreign yoke. This friendship can only be achieved if the Hindus assure the Muslims that they do not mean to establish a Hindu rule in India after the British rule is overthrown, and the Muslims assure the Hindus in turn that they do not want any power to rule India. Mutual confidence and trust is the most essential thing for the liberty of India. Whatever **treaty or decision** be arrived at between these two communities should be firm and sound. If now the Hindus and Muslims join to overthrow the British yoke and if it were replaced by Muslim yoke not only will there be no peace in India but India's liberty would not last six months." In his concluding article of the series, Lala Lajpat Rai wrote—"The Hindu-Muslim relation (friendship) should be so firm and consolidated that Hindus should prefer Muslims to all other nations in the world and similarly the Indian Musalmans should prefer Hindus to all others be they Muslims or Non-Muslims."

He went on to say that he had no reason to doubt that the Muslim Nationalists did not desire the Amir's rule in India. The duty of the Hindus was clear in this matter. As long as they believed in the principle of Non-co-operation, they could not help the Government of India, but in the case of some settlement with it non-co-operation would not be binding upon them. If ever the British Government was so weakened that some other foreign power overthrew it, the Hindus would have to think what to do, because they would not like to see India under any foreign power or nation. He would not hesitate in saying that though he was willing to accept Indian Muslim's political ascendancy, yet he was not prepared to accept any foreign sway **whether Muslim or Non-Muslim**.

We would point out that the expressions "treaty" and "decision" are very significant and indicate the true mentality with which the problem is being approached by the Lalaji and his friends. Mere

treaties and alliances to overthrow the common enemy will not guarantee the continuity of Hindu-Moslem unity "after British rule is overthrown." We cannot be blind to the lessons of History. The spectacle of the second Balkan War among the allies who opposed Turkey is fresh in the minds of all educated people. How in the face of all these evidences of History can we blindly rely on the assurance that the **treaty or decision arrived at between these communities** will be firm and sound? Further, on the question of communal representation which the Lala Sahib criticises may we point out for his edification that even the extremist congress, which he supports, has given its sanction to the principle of communal representation. We find that at a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee held in Bombay on June 14 and 15, 1921, Mr. Gandhi presiding, the following resolution among others was passed:

(2). "It was resolved that in electing delegates to the Congress and Provincial and other conferences, and members to the All-India Congress committee and other congress bodies consisting of representatives, all provincial congress committees be advised to give full effect to the proportion fixed in the Lucknow compact with reference to Mahamedan representatives in the Legislative Council."

Shortly after the publication of the articles referred to above, Lala Lajpat Rai said at a meeting which he addressed in Simla—"When you will have obtained Swaraj, you should prefer Mahomedan supremacy to that of all other nations." This makes the expression Swaraj still more indefinite, as we fail to follow the logic of the Lala's advice. We suppose some will say that Swaraj is not for those who seek for logic in the speeches of "patriots," or those who remember the lessons of History!!!

Let us however proceed. In discussing the problems of the Ali Brothers' creed in relation to the Afghan menace, we have drawn pointed attention to the fact that the mentality with which the Ali Brothers and their followers have approached the problem is

not one which will contribute to a growth of genuine Hindu-Muslim unity, and further that the ideals and ambitions of what may be described as Political Pan-Islamism constitute a great menace to Indian Nationalism.

The Hindus cannot further overlook the Mahomedan doctrine, at least in the extreme form in which the champions of the Khilafat professedly hold it, that the world is divided into two parts—Dar-ul-Islam or world of Islam under Mahomedan rule, and Dar-ul Harb or world of war in which infidels may rule for the time being, **but only till the hour has struck for the sword of Islam to subdue them.** To which of these worlds will India belong when she has attained Swaraj?

CHAPTER XVIII.

GOVERNMENT POLICY AND THE DUTY OF CITIZENS.

Where the Loyalists believe that the present attitude of government towards the non-co-operators is far too lenient and that, as a result, innocent and law-abiding people are being oppressed in various ways and in open defiance of the law by these exponents of liberty and equality, the agitators assert and complain with a sense of outraged "honesty" that government are bent upon a policy of repression to suppress their patriotic movement. All governments have a primary duty to perform, *viz.*, to safeguard and protect the rights and liberties of individual citizens consistent with the maintenance of law and order, and to see that the Laws of the Land are respected and obeyed. When there is a tendency, not only to disrespect the ordinary Laws of the Land but also to preach propaganda to encourage people to break them, it is the duty of government to take all reasonable action under the law to prevent the breach or the tendency to break the law. If the government in India fail to perform this elementary duty, it amounts to abdication in favour of the agitators.

As a matter of fact, Government have in some cases been driven to take proceedings against persons who by the violence of their language and violence of action, have rendered themselves liable to the law, or who have been guilty of criminal intimidation. As regards this alleged policy of repression, Lord Ronaldshay said to a deputation which waited on him—

"To speak of this as a policy of repression is a travesty of language. I notice that a speaker at a meeting held yesterday is reported to have said that they are being persecuted for love of

their country. Nothing could be further from truth. They are not being persecuted at all. They are being placed on trial because by the extravagant violence of their language they appear to have committed a breach of the law. I have yet to learn that violence and abusive language calculated to bring government or any class of His Majesty's subjects into hatred and contempt or to excite those addicted to acts of violence is the same thing as love of country. I should have thought it was the reverse."

It is the duty of all peace-loving patriotic citizens to assist the cause of Law and Order. Mere blind carping criticism of government's policy will not contribute to the maintenance of public tranquillity.

The attitude of the Government of India towards the non-co-operation movement and the policy they intend to follow in order to deal with it when the movement and its exponents cease to practise its motto of "peaceful methods and non-violence" have been clearly expounded by the official spokesmen on behalf of government, and this policy has been fully endorsed by the popular representatives in the Indian Legislative Assembly. The debate on this question discloses different view points from the Government, Moderate, and Extremist sides, but the elected representatives of the people in the Assembly almost unanimously and without any division accepted the Government declaration of policy. This Constitutional Debate on the momentous problem which is absorbing the attention of all intelligent and educated people, is a deliberate record of the views and attitude of the best representative intellects in India. We have therefore taken the liberty to reproduce the Debate as an Appendix to this book, and we invite the careful attention of readers thereto.

CHAPTER XIX.

GANDHIAN NON-CO-OPERATION IN ACTUAL PERFORMANCE.

Doctrine of "soul force" and non-violence in words, speeches, deeds and thoughts, in actual practice by non-co-operators.

It has been solemnly declared by Mr. Gandhi "that nothing can stop the onward march of the nation so much as violence." He proceeded to lay down the dictum—

"Non-co-operators must be true as well to the spirit as to the letter of their vow. They may forget non-co-operation but they dare not forget non-violence!!! Swaraj depends upon our ability to control all the forces of violence on our side!!! We must refrain from sitting Dhurna, we must refrain from crying 'shame, shame' to any body, we must not use any coercion to persuade our people to adopt our way. We must guarantee to them the same freedom we claim for ourselves."

These are a clear set of instructions for all so-called followers of the doctrine of "soul force," but they appear to have remained within the columns of Young India where they were published and do not appear to have made any impression on any of the immediate lieutenants of Mr. Gandhi, not to speak of the shallow headed boys and young men who are encouraged to cry "Gandhi maharaj ki jai" anywhere and everywhere whether they understand what they are about or not. To these people, the true patriotism is—

- "Demonstrations make and school boys annoy,
- "'Bande-mataram' or 'Gandhi ki jai'.
- "Attend all meetings and shout applause,
- "Whate'er the speech or whate'er the cause.
- "Cry shame on him who differs with you,
- "That's the sign of patriotism true."

Not to speak of others, Mr. Gandhi himself has been found to transgress in some particulars the Law which he has laid down for his own followers.

It was pointedly brought to the notice of Mr. Gandhi by his sober critics when he first launched his non-co-operation war that it was highly objectionable to excite the masses with politics, for the simple reason that they had not the sufficient intelligence or spirituality to understand or help in the experiment which was to bring India "Swäräj" by the simple exercise of soul force. But Mr. Gandhi, styled **Mahatma** by his followers, believed himself infallible and obstinately stuck to his theories and doctrines, and we have now the spectacle all over India of a cult of gross violence in speech, deeds and thought being practised daily by those very people who style themselves non-co-operators. The whole trouble is that the people who call themselves followers of Mr. Gandhi only obey him when it suits them to do so, but otherwise they merely shout "Gandhi ki jai" without rhyme or reason and follow the inclinations of their own unbridled passions and fancies. Mr. Gandhi, in his blind zeal, managed to overlook the simple fact that no man, however gifted, can control forces that are let loose among irresponsible and unintelligent people. He failed to remember what playing at politics means: that it means playing with property, that it means playing with liberty, that it means playing with the lives of men. Leaders in the political arena have always to remember all that, when they take upon themselves the responsibility of calling men to action. Mr. Gandhi has proved himself wholly incompetent and powerless to enforce obedience to the instructions and mandates which he issued from time to time for adoption by his followers. We have seen and read how the practice of non-co-operation is everywhere leading to direct violence and collision not only between people and people but also between the people and the administrative machinery. We have seen that public meetings were broken up by force and that men were assaulted and the people were prevented from exercising their lawful rights.

The actual practice of violence in speech and writing have already assumed such a scandalous magnitude on the Extremist platforms and in the press, that Mr. Andrews, one of Mr. Gandhi's prominent chelas, had to write to the press "joining in the protest against violence of speech and the increasing violence of action on the popular side." He went on to add that if he himself had transgressed the bounds of calm and reasoned statement in the excitement of the times in which we live, he sincerely regretted it," and he proceeded to say—"I would plead in all the earnestness of true affection with those who may be influenced by my words, that the one thing most damaging to all in the present popular movement, with which I am in sympathy, is the irresponsible use of violent inflammatory platform language such as may directly or indirectly provoke violent action."

Alas, we have sad experience of the events in different parts in India which indicate that this wise appeal fell on deaf ears, as did all other previous and subsequent injunctions, and evidence is accumulating to prove that the non-co-operation propaganda is provoking its exponents and followers to violent action which has direct result in bloodshed, destruction of valuable property and other outrages.

The tragic events at Giridih, Malegaon, Aligarh and other places are all cases in point. All these incidents prove that even *bonâ fide* workers cannot control the crowds and the forces which they themselves bring into existence. In all the non-co-operation demonstrations which culminated in open violence, there were probably people who were headed by leaders who kept them under some sort of discipline but behind them always followed hooligans ready for any mischief.

We have thus the blood-curdling spectacle of the Malegaon outrages where policemen on duty were battered to death and burnt, a Hindu temple burnt to ashes, property valued at over several lakhs of rupees destroyed by fire and otherwise, and prominent anti-non-co-operators singularly marked out for loot and violence. At Giridih as in Aligarh, policemen engaged

in their lawful duties were severely handled and much government property and buildings were destroyed by fire. It will be interesting to read in this connection the petitions filed before the trying Magistrate by four of the accused in the Giridih riots case—

“That your petitioner is accused on a charge of unlawful assembly and rioting on April 25th, 1921. That your petitioner admits that he was present on the occasion, but did not use any violence and regrets extremely that violence was used. That realising that in such cases the eventual outcome of the non-co-operation propaganda may lead, and has frequently led, to violence and destruction of property, he gives this assurance that in future he will have nothing to do with this movement and will also endeavour to dissuade others from adopting a course liable to lead to a breach of the Law. That your petitioner is prepared to pay such compensation to the persons who may have been injured, including the Inspector and the Sub-Inspector of Police, or for damages to property belonging either to government or to private persons as the Deputy Commissioner may determine. That under these circumstances your petitioner prays that in view of this apology for the past and assurance of amendment for the future, the Local Government may be pleased to direct the withdrawal of the prosecution against him.”

The above is indeed an exposure of the so-called peaceful character of the non-co-operation movement. But to proceed with our narrative.

At Nagpur, an agitation for excise reform culminated in an attempt at forcible suppression of excise sales in the District Magistrate's ejlas, assaults on intending bidders within the kutchery compound, the stoning of magistrates, police and other high officials, the systematic looting and wrecking of excise shops, the destruction of property worth several thousands of rupees and other acts of gross violence. Similar outrages on a smaller scale were repeated in many other places and brought down the reproach of Mr. Gandhi who was forced “to condemn the spirit of violence displayed at Nagpur and other places and to

exhort the people to be tolerant and carry out the congress mandate peacefully." He further appealed to them "not to use pressure on excise shops and people who drink."

We have seen instances of monstrous and outrageous sentences passed by the non-co-operation panchayets which in their ingenuity are parallel with and even surpass the martial law punishments which the people so much condemned. We have seen how a gang of irresponsible boys started up trouble and disorder in Calcutta and other places amidst applause from the so-called leaders, to prevent more sober boys from regularly attending to their studies and going to their schools and colleges. Mr. Gandhi was again compelled to make a feeble protest and to issue an admonition to the effect that "non-co-operating students must not coerce other students who did not leave their colleges and join them and to refrain from sitting dhurna at the gates of educational institutions and examination halls." But Mr. Gandhi has failed to realise what a monster he has let loose and that it has gone beyond his control and that the people in his name are daily proceeding to greater follies and crimes. We have seen how in Benares, the non-co-operating students' excesses reached such a magnitude in connection with the Sanskrit examinations during March 1921, that even when Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya intervened, urging the youth to give up all picketting and other violent methods of keeping students away from the examinations, all his sacrifices and services to the country were forgotten and he was made the subject of scurrilous abuse, and attempts were even made to assault him. We have seen how veteran patriots like the Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri and a host of others are frequently jeered at and hooted, Ministers of the Reformed Councils systematically insulted and Moderates' meetings broken up.

These have become a standing nuisance, and Mr. Gandhi, speaking at Gujranwalla so far back as February 1921, had to raise a note of warning only to fall however on deaf ears. He said that the non-co-

operators should be tolerant and patient, and should not hoot down those who differed from them. Mr. Sastri, Sir Surendranath Banerjea and Mr. Chintamani were their elders and were true patriots, and they should not cry shame on them. He asked them to leave the western habit of hooting to their elders. But what can such advice do, when Mr. Gandhi and his lieutenants could not control the disgraceful spectacle which took place under their very noses in the special session of the Indian National Congress at Calcutta in September 1920, when Mrs. Annie Besant, an ex-president of the congress, who stood to support the election of Lala Lajpat Rai to the Chair, was continuously hooted and vilely insulted for an unobstructed period of 15 minutes. People seemed to have been more orderly even in Satan's Council as we read in *Paradise Lost*.

Instances of non-co-operation hooliganism and violence can be multiplied without number, but we think that the above will be sufficient to give some idea where the country is gradually drifting to as the immediate result of this movement.

While narrating non-co-operation atrocities, we however cannot pass unnoticed the recent insane strike and hartals engineered at Chandpur and other places in East Bengal by the Bengal leaders. This strike, according to Mr. Andrews, was responsible for many unnecessary deaths and much demoralisation among the coolies. Mr. C. R. Das solemnly declared that these strikes were not labour troubles but that they were national strikes and that they were part of the general movement of non-co-operation in that part of the province. The strikes continued in spite of the earnest entreaties of Mr. Andrews and appeals from other stedy headed people. Even Mr. Gandhi roundly condemned these strikes, but the E. B. leaders did not seem to have paid any attention to Gandhi's condemnation. In several places, preposterous attempts were made in the name of the Local Congress Committees to ration people by the issue of tickets with the object of starving not only officials, but non-officials, Indians and Europeans

into submission to the Congress Dictatorate. The strikes have been found to be oppressive in the highest degree, and the ordinary people were the worst sufferers.

Immediately following the Malegaon horrors, Mr. Gandhi, writing in *Young India*, stated—"The workers must be doubly careful in their talks. They must cease to talk of the evils of the government and the officials, whether European or Indian. Bluster must give place to the work of building up put before the nation by the congress. We must be patient if there is no response to the demands for men, money and munitions. **All police orders must be strictly obeyed. There should be no processions or hartals** when known workers are persecuted or imprisoned."

Very good instructions all these undoubtedly, but they were poured on closed ears and had no effect.

The campaign of vilification proceeded unabated, and Mr. Gandhi in the course of an article in his organ on the subject of the apology of the Ali Brothers added—"we who are fighting the battle for freedom must be exact in our language. It would not be a bad thing to read our speeches or not to make any at all."

But what are the followers of Mr. Gandhi to do when the Mahatmaji himself fails to practise his own teachings. Mr. Gandhi not only declares the present government **Satanic** in season and out of season, but takes every opportunity, deserved or undeserved, to make a violent attack on the Government. In a recent article in June 1921 in *Young India*, Mr. Gandhi openly declared that he has intentionally and wilfully continued to break the law regarding sedition and has deliberately courted arrest, and that sooner or later, and that during this year if he can carry the country with him, he must bring about a situation when the government must arrest him or grant the people's demands. Again, Mr. Gandhi's irresponsible writings on the Afghan Menace and the veiled language used in many of his articles forced his **chela** Mr. Andrews to put the question directly to him through *Young India* "whether his articles on the Afghan Bogey were not an invitation to the Afghans to invade

the Indian border and thus did not Mr. Gandhi become a direct party to violence?"

We think we have sufficiently exposed the performances of the non-co-operators—both leaders and followers—to prove that the movement launched by them will drag the country towards chaos and anarchy.

CHAPTER XX.

ACTUAL RESULTS.

What has the non-co-operation movement so far achieved?

What has this preposterous propaganda done for India? Can it point to any real right won by it, any widening of liberty, any lightening of the poverty and disease weighing upon the poor? It has done an untold amount of mischief; what real and substantial good can be shown to throw into the other scale?

We have found that those who understood the position and did not join the movement were shouted down by their opponents and refused a hearing, were insulted right and left and were denounced as renegades and traitors. The non-co-operation propaganda is responsible for bitterness against the State by undermining the foundations of discipline and respect for law and order. It has in many places established a tyrannical suppression of freedom of speech and action. The movement has in fact resulted in tyranny and oppression and a worse type of pernicious despotism has been set up under it in the name of democracy. In short, the movement is leading the country towards disorder and anarchy.

Lord Ronaldshay in the course of his reply to the deputation which waited on him in connection with the railway and other strikes in East Bengal complained that it had become the fashion for agitators and prominent non-co-operation leaders to indulge in wild, abusive and lying speech and that the propaganda of calculated and infamous falsehood in which many of the platform speakers and writers in the press had been indulging was polluting the public life of the country.

A serious charge indeed. This is no exaggeration but is a statement of actual fact.

That noble soul Mrs. Annie Besant, whose services for the uplifting of India are unique, in course of the summing up of her presidential speech before the Malabar Reforms Conference in April 1921, said—“Non-co-operation has done absolutely nothing which is of any use to us during the year of its existence but it has weakened political activity, deprived the country of the services of a few able men, caused troubles in families, divisions among educated class, violences among the lower classes, social antagonisms and the denial of free speech to all who do not repeat its shibboleths and it has spread demoralising hypocrisy among those who profess it in principle but do not practise it, abusing to cover their defection more honest people who openly reject it both in principle and in practice.”

In every case in which the non-co-operators unnecessarily intermeddled, they have succeeded in doing nothing but inflict misery on their fellow countrymen. The dust and fumes raised by the agitation over the Assam coolie exodus, ended in a fiasco. This has been exposed by Swami Darsananda who stated that repatriation of the coolies practically resulted in sending them to their death. After giving facts and figures, the Swami said—“For these reasons the coolies should not have been repatriated till definite arrangements had been made for providing work for them. In this particular case it was futile to bring away the coolies from the gardens and send them to villages from which I found 50 to 60 men daily leaving for the tea gardens owing to the famine conditions prevailing there.” The “colony returned” have suffered in precisely the same way as the tea-garden coolies. Think of what happened to the Muhajrins in Afganistan and Turkistan. Consider how the future of hundreds of students has been ruined by the boycott of schools and colleges, and how these boys with their fine ideals are at the present moment being employed in sordid activities which are bound to ruin their moral sense. Then again, we have the strikes and hartals which simultaneously eat up the savings of the working classes,

involve traders in immense losses, and send up prices everywhere to the great suffering and hardship of the masses. It is the fashion with the non-co-operators to pretend that they have the sanction of heaven for their actions. Blasphemy could hardly go further. The really devout see the finger of God in what is happening but it is the finger pointing with terrible insistence to the moral law which decrees that as men sow so they shall reap. The extremists, however, blind to the inferences that must be drawn from the results that have followed their activities, are now preparing for even greater follies and crimes. They are cutting away below the foundation of law and order. To the educated Indians, the only view that can be exposed is that of the desolation and ruin that exists in other countries where the foundations of society have been destroyed.

CHAPTER XXI.

ENGLAND AND INDIA.

Non-co-operation a direct menace to the glorious co-operative future.

All true patriots, except those who are blinded by prejudice, recognise the immense benefits which have accrued to India through the British connection. The streaks of light that are seen through the clouds of ages of past misgovernment are ushering us into the dawn of a brighter day. England came to the fallen Indians, as Keshab Chandra Sen rightly said, as a saviour to lift them up in the scale of nations. Without her helping hand, India would have grovelled in the dust for centuries more.

When Lord Dufferin was leaving the shores of India, he said—"What can I say to you, Europeans and natives alike but this? Whatever you do, live in unity and concord and good-fellowship with each other: fate has united both races in a community of interests and neither can do without the other. Therefore, again I say, co-operate with each other in a generous and genial spirit".

This appeal was made more than 30 years ago, but it requires to be often repeated till it is impressed on the hearts of all lovers of the country. Let us—Britons and Indians—march through life—arm in arm putting our shoulders to the wheel. Britons and Indians can defy all the rest of the world put together. What a glorious spectacle this march of Britons and Indians would be for the rest of the world!! This is the ideal about which the poets sang and patriots dreamt—the magnificent blending and synthesis of the cultures of the East and the West to inaugurate a Co-operative Spiritualised Civilisation for the redemption of humanity from materialism!

But all this is threatened by Mr. Gandhi's gospel of Hate which is being put into action under the name of Non-co-operation!!

CHAPTER XXII.

NON-CO-OPERATION—A DOCTRINE OF SATANIC HATE.

We see on all sides that there has been a determination to sow broadcast the seed of hatred. We have given enough material to show that the non-co-operators' mentality, in spite of all their protestations of the doctrine of "soul force", is a concentrated essence of "Hate-Mentality." Even in approaching a purely social problem like the Excise Reform, the non-co-operators could not transcend their prejudices. We have seen how they have tried to use even the Temperance Movement as a political weapon to break up the administration, and have created race prejudice which has led to unhappy relationships between common subjects of a common King. There have been in India genuine and *bonâ fide* temperance workers who have been trying for over 2 or 3 decades to bring about a "temperance reform" by legitimate means, but many of them have been compelled to hold themselves aloof from this neo-temperance agitation as it has unnecessarily introduced political animus into the movement. In vain appeals were made to Mr. Gandhi for a review together of the whole situation. Temperance men and Mr. Gandhi are one in their ideals of prohibition for India, and the sooner the better. If the political animus be taken away from the Temperance Reform Movement, and it be based on a social, moral and religious consideration, temperance workers would be delighted to associate their activities in this matter with the activities of Mr. Gandhi and his men. But the latter, in their zeal to discredit the Government and to bring it on its knees, overlooked the sound appeal, as a result of which genuine temperance workers have to keep themselves away from

this neo-temperance movement which has been transformed into an active gospel of hate.

As in temperance, so on the questions of National Education and Swadeshi, the non-co-operators have introduced a blind prejudice and political animus disclosing an acute "hate-mentality." As a matter of fact, this "hate-mentality" dominates and rules all their activities and colours everything they take in hand. They are apt to forget that hatred does not belong to God, it belongs to the devil. Oh what a spectacle; this practice and preaching of the gospel of hate by the exponents of so-called "soul force."

The ghastly hate incited by Mr. Gandhi is the mark of the activity of the enemies of mankind. He is becoming more and more violent and now speaks of "when we draw the sword". If in addition to the array of facts which we have already disclosed further evidence were needed of the fact that he is becoming more and more the tool of the powers of darkness, it is provided by his policy of breaking the connection between India and Great Britain, on which depends the future peace and liberty of the world. The linking of Europe and Asia in mutual love and service, the blending of the ideals of East and West, the spiritualising of the world by India as dreamt by Swami Vivekananda, Keshab Chandra Sen and a host of others, the building of a mighty Indo-British Commonwealth of Free Nations, the model of the yet distant Federation of the World—all this is now at stake and will be decided by the issue of the present struggle. The dark forces are here making their stand, and against the great Reform Movement leading peacefully to Home Rule by the co-operation of India and Great Britain, they have started this propaganda of Hate, of growing violence, which, if successful, will tear asunder East and West, Asia and Europe, India and Britain, and wither the fair hopes of peace, amity and mutual helpfulness and service. Hate can only destroy, it cannot construct, and like the mark which ancient craftsmen placed on their work, so is Hate the Mark of the enemy of Humanity. The flood of destructive human passions is let loose

by hate, and rushes on its devastating way. This is where the vaunted cult of "Soul Force" is leading the country, and it is high time that a determined effort is made from all directions to stem the flood.

AFTERWORD.

We have come to the end of our imperfect exposition. We have attempted to show in the foregoing pages how the avowed gospel of "soul force" and "non-violent non-co-operation" has been indiscriminately thrown among the people who have not and cannot have the training, the discipline, the education, the intelligence, the morality or the spirituality to understand what they really mean. The exponents of the movement are systematically flouting the elementary principles of the gospel and have in many places set up a pernicious form of despotism in the name of democracy. The movement in fact, whatever their intentions might have been, resulted in tyranny and oppression on the people themselves.

Non-violent non-co-operation has long disappeared and engines of bloodshed are already on the move. The movement is leading the country towards chaos and anarchy. So far as the direct aim and the programme of the movement are concerned, it is a failure. It might have indirectly contributed to some good to the country or to particular communities or classes, but is it worth while to incur the tremendous risks which this revolutionary movement involves to the country and the people for this small result. The whole movement is revolutionary in its character—industrially, socially and politically.

We are now at the parting of the ways, and the future destiny of the country depends on the choice we make as to the proper path. We therefore appeal to the people and specially to the Indian intelligentsia, to choose the path rightly. We repeat to them the stirring peroration with which Mrs. Annie Besant closed her memorable Malabar address:—

"Two ways lie open before you. Choose ye which ye will tread, but by all the memories of

the uncounted millenia of your glorious past, by all the splendid hopes of a yet more glorious future, by the sacred names of immortal pioneers of liberty, who wrought and laboured for India's self-rule during seven and thirty years since the congress was founded, leaving the impress of their footprints to inspire us for the short remainder of the way, by the reverence for your fathers who are watching you from the other side of death, by your love for your children and for the sake of the unborn who awaits the result of your work on the other side of birth, above all for the dear sake of the motherland, whose destiny lies in your hands stop and think, reason and meditate; lift your eyes to the Most High God and to the **Rishis**, prophets and saints that love this sacred land. Then choose your way. Choose your path. God grant that you may choose that which leads to freedom. God guard you from choosing that which leads to anarchy, to the failure of India to accomplish the mighty mission of the spiritualisation of the new era."

APPENDIX I.

RESOLUTION ON REPRESSIVE MEASURES. . .

(Legislative Assembly Debates, dated the 23rd March, 1921.)

Dr. Nanda Lal: With the permission of the Chair, I move the Resolution which runs as follows:—

“That this Assembly recommends to the Governor-General in Council that the Government should adhere to the declaration of its policy made in October and November last and ask the Local Governments to stop all repressive measures now being used all over India.”

Sir,—I think there is a great truth in the contents of this resolution. I believe all members of this Assembly can recall to their minds the contents of the most brilliant and hopeful declaration made by the Government. Now, the whole country was greatly delighted at hearing the most sincere and genuine declarations, and the whole country anticipated that all repressive measures would be a matter of history now and that we should never see them in future. But the unfortunate thing is, that it is not a matter of history, and that we are compelled to see repressive measures put into execution somewhere or other. Therefore the strong element of discontent, which unfortunately happened to exist some time back, revives to our disappointment. We, the representatives of this country, do feel it and we therefore urge upon the Government that they should kindly adhere to those declarations. I am sorry to say, that on some occasions, Government have failed, for the reasons best known to themselves, to adhere to that policy. Government might have got very plausible and perhaps convincing reasons according to their own lights. The view of the country is this, that the Government had no justification for embarking upon a policy of repressive measure; instead of putting an end to them, Government is, in some cases, seriously adopting repressive measures. Therefore the country has deeply felt the position, and we are here placing the message of the country before this House.

The repressive measures, which have been adopted, as I have submitted already, sometimes here or there, had no justification. Can we ask the Government what was the reason for the introduction of repressive measures? No doubt, in the Punjab and in some other quarters, undesirable

incidents did occur. Taking them into consideration, remembering some other events which took place in other parts of the country, the country taking the view of the majority of the people submits very respectfully that the Government was wrong. If Government had adhered to the policy which was declared, they would have been respected much more. With these few remarks I put forward this submission before the House in the hope that the Honourable Members of this Assembly will heartily support this motion.

Mr. Amjad Ali : If there is any duty so pious on the part of this Assembly it is I think the duty to support this resolution.....I offer my thanks to the Chair and to the Honourable the Home Member of the Government that an opportunity had been given to us to let the Government know that the feelings of the country are very much exasperated and the result would be disastrous in the near future unless and until the Government is pleased to consider that it is time these repressive measures should be put an end to. Sir, the result of the drastic repressive measures, I should say in India has been most disastrous. I am told, Sir, that the Bihar and Orissa Government has issued a circular most repressive in its character, so much so that instead of quieting down the people, that measure has exasperated them and they are ready to undergo anything to carry on their object of non-co-operation by holding meetings here and there.....Sir, I should, for the sake of the good name of the Government to be achieved by the redemption of the pledges that have been held out to us by that declaration, hope and trust that the Government of India would be pleased to consider and see that the subjects of His Gracious Majesty are no longer in such a state and subjected to such hardships and that unless and until the Government of India is pleased enough to go to their rescue, their position will be most disastrous, most unhappy.....

Mr. B. H. Jatkari : I would like to say a few words on the resolution that has been moved by Dr. Nanda Lal. The Honourable Members of this House must have read the resolution of the Government of India, Home Department, dated Simla, the 6th November, 1920, which contains the declaration of policy referred to in this resolution. I shall only give the substance of this policy. It is a policy of non-interference, which the Government of India has declared to have adopted towards the non-co-operation movement and this is based on three considerations, *viz.*—

Firstly—The reluctance of the Government to interfere with liberty of speech and the freedom of the Press at a time when India was on the threshold of a great advance towards realisation of self-

government within the Empire, when the first elections were in sight.

Secondly—The Government was always reluctant to take action against individuals, which would give them unnecessary importance and an opportunity of evoking false sympathy in their adherents and thus swell their number.

Thirdly—That Government relied on the commonsense of India and believed in the sanity of the classes and masses.

This policy of non-interference was, however, subject to the limitation that the movement would be non-violent and will not endanger public peace. So far it is all right, but I do not associate myself with the view mentioned in the Government Resolution that the movement was unconstitutional. In the remaining part of it, the Government of India depicts the perils it may lead to, if the movement spreads to the students and the masses.

This then, was the policy of Government declared in November, but what do we find in February and March, within a period of not more than four months? The Provincial Governments have taken up this weapon of repression in their hands all at once. Seditious Meetings Act is being freely applied to district after district. We hear prosecutions undertaken under Sedition and under the Security Sections. Persons are served with notices under Section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, restraining them from speaking and if I remember aright their number has already exceeded 125. The same section has been freely used to stop all agitation by extending its application to towns and even to whole-sale districts. It is really a novel use of the section which, though mild in form, is nothing but repression. In my unfortunate province, prosecutions under 124-A and 153-A have been launched against two prominent men—one of them being a Vice-Chairman of the Nagpur Municipality. Even in a small district place like Yeotmal from which I come, security cases are going on against volunteers who were found preaching temperance. The reasons assigned for taking such repressive measures are strange and appears to have nothing to do with non-co-operation. In our province, the action appears to have been directed against the temperance movement. In some cases, the agitation against *begar* (forced labour) is said to be the reason for this action.

What does this all indicate? Have the Provincial Governments adopted this policy of repression on their own responsibility or on the initiative of the Central Government?His Excellency the Viceroy has stated about the Reforms in his opening speech of the 9th February:

“For the first time the principle of autocracy which had not been wholly discarded in all other earlier re-

forms was definitely abandoned. The conception of the British Government as a benevolent despotism was finally renounced."

While speaking of the powers of the Indian Legislature, His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught said:

"You may feel that the Ministers in the provinces will be in close touch with popular causes and have larger opportunities of public service. But it is true only in a limited sense. It is the clear intention of the Act of 1919 that the policy and decisions of the Government of India should be influenced, to an extent incomparably greater than they have been in the past, by the views of the Indian Legislature; and the Government will give the fullest possible effect, consistent with their own responsibilities to Parliament, to this principle of the new constitution. From now onwards your influence will extend to every sphere of the Central Government; it will be felt in every part of its administration. You are concerned not with the province, but with all British India, and statesmanship could not ask for a nobler field of exercise."

If such are the powers of the Legislative Councils in the New Era, would it be too much to expect that the Councils should have been consulted before a general repressive policy was adopted?

Let us examine the conditions in February and March, and whether they call for such a change in policy. The non-co-operation movement is and has been declared to be non-violent in character in words and deeds not only against Government, but amongst people themselves. It cannot, however, be denied that in some cases the students acted with over-enthusiasm, but now the agitation about the withdrawal of students which once had attained the highest pitch, is deteriorating. Many students have returned to their schools; others are availing themselves of the national schools that are being started. The impracticability of some of the other items of the non-co-operation programme are visible and they do not justify any repressive action. It is no doubt true that this non-co-operation has its effects in awakening a spirit of self-consciousness among the people. They are now more capable of understanding the agitation carried on by the educated people to remedy their grievances.

Can the Government deny that there are many grievances of the people which are yet to be removed? The economic condition of the people is miserable. The evils of litigation are so great that they have disturbed the peace of every village. The drink evil and the system of forced labour are growing without check and are demoralising the

masses. The agitation in this connection has nothing to do with non-co-operation. The new reformed councils have not been a panacea to any of these long standing grievances of the people. They had nothing to evoke confidence in the people. None of the repressive laws have been repealed; mere appointment of committee does not appeal to the masses as anything substantial. Their previous experience of such committees is far from being satisfactory. The year is one of economic distress, famine is raging in many parts of the country, and the prospect of additional taxation is disturbing their minds.

The Government ought therefore to realize the strained feelings of the country, and any adoption of repressive policy at this moment would lead to embarrassment worse than before.

The very considerations which led to the declaration of the policy in November ought to be of greater weight now in adhering to the same policy of non-interference.

The Government need not be so anxious of non-co-operation. In the new form of Government, it may settle down as a principle of one party in the land. It is true that the non-co-operators should not have boycotted the councils, but should have sent their own representatives who would have been able to press their views openly in the councils. There are such parties in the Western countries which are tolerated and allowed to have free deliberation. There is a party of direct action even in England which is in no way less than a non-co-operation party.

The principle has come to stay in India and the Government, by having recourse to repression, would drive it underground with dangerous results. Let it be met fairly in its face. Government should by a policy of conciliation, respect the feelings of the people and create confidence in representative institutions by allowing them greater control over the affairs of the country.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught said:

"I repudiate, in the most emphatic manner, the idea that the administration of India has been or ever can be based on principles of force or terrorism."

I request the Government of India to show by action that this is so, and to put a stop to the repressive policy which is nothing but a policy of force and terrorism.

I beseech the Government of India to adhere to its former policy of non-interference and ask all provincial governments to adopt the same policy of non-interference.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: I welcome the debate to-day because it will enable me not only to place before this Assembly an appreciation of the political situation at the moment, and to explain what our policy has been, together with the motives which underlie

it, but also to secure, I hope, the views of this Assembly and suggestions of the Honourable Members as to this policy and the changes, if any, which we ought to make in it. The moment is particularly opportune for such a debate, because the question will come up for discussion before the Executive Council in a few days. I may say that we periodically re-examine the situation and review our policy in the Executive Council, and what is said in this Assembly to-day will be placed before the Council for their consideration at an early date; and while I am speaking on the question of policy, may I say, it is based on one great underlying principle, and that our one object is to promote the progress of this country towards responsible government and at the same time to preserve public tranquillity. Those are the two objects which we have in view. The situation is one full of complexity as anyone who considers the facts even for a short time will realise. I know of no historical instance of such a great change in the government as we now have inaugurated in this country being effected peaceably even in a homogeneous country; and in this country there are great additional difficulties, some permanent and some of a temporary character. There are, for instance, complexities caused by differences of race, religion, by the very character of the Government, and by the vast distances by which different parts of India are divided. To these, at this time, must be added temporary difficulties of a very serious kind, economic, religious, financial, and I may say quite frankly, political difficulties also. Now, all these difficulties have been exploited by the non-co-operation party to the utmost limit. There is no doubt of this. In their efforts to paralyse the Government—that is the declared object which they have in view—and in their efforts to achieve that object, there is no source of discontent which they have not used. Wherever they find discord between employer and employee, there some agent, some emissary of the non-co-operation party, proceeds at once fostering discontent—promoting ill-feeling. Where there is racial feeling, as at times there has been in my own province and other provinces, there again these missionaries hurry on their evil errand further to stimulate ill-feeling and disorder. Where there are quarrels between landlord and tenant—have we not seen this in the United Provinces—there again proceed these emissaries of evil to propagate unrest and stir up disorder; the ultimate object being, we are told, to paralyse the Government and to secure immediate self-government of this country. Many of these adherents of the party do not hesitate even to say, that they seek a severance of India from the British Empire. Now a movement of this kind cannot but be extremely dangerous and full of evil potentialities. It is purely destructive and so far as I have been able to ascertain, contains no element of

constructive ability. Self-government, as I have often said before, connotes the power of self-protection, and a country which cannot protect itself is not prepared for immediate and complete self-government. Even if you were to have that most impossible of all things, a peaceful revolution, and in the twinkling of an eye the whole character of the government was changed and this present administration was paralysed in the manner which Mr. Gandhi boasted he will achieve in a few months, what does this Assembly think would be the result? Would it not be ruin and anarchy, chaos and disorder, the destruction of every vested interest and everything else that is valuable in the land?

Nevertheless, while we are fully aware of the evil potentialities of this movement, the government has hitherto restricted the measures against it to the narrowest limits compatible with the maintenance of the public peace. They always hoped, and they still hope, that the sanity of the people of this country will turn them away from a scheme that can but result in disaster. They have had every confidence that the efforts of the sane and moderate politicians would have a great influence on public opinion. This is the view put forward in the resolution of 6th November last to which one of the speakers referred, and I desire to take this opportunity of acknowledging gratefully the many efforts that have been made by sound and loyal citizens of this country to combat and counteract the mischievous propaganda of the non-co-operation party. I don't know if I shall be doing wrong in naming two persons who have been particularly active in this direction, but I may be excused for saying that I believe that Mrs. Besant and Mr. Sastri have earned the thanks of all good citizens in this country by their courage and patriotism, and when this Assembly finds the Government Benches complimenting Mrs. Besant it may take it that the compliment is really well deserved.

Well, Mr. Gandhi's present position is this. He has failed to a great extent with the educated classes; his efforts, in so far as the boycott of these councils is concerned, have, as the presence of Honourable Members here shows, been a failure; the number of titles surrendered has been very small, and, so far as I have heard, very few lawyers have given up the fees which they earn by their practice in the courts. It is true that the movement was a temporary success among immature students, but even that success was effervescent and is, I think, now passing away for most of the young men are, under better influences, returning to their schools and colleges. Well, seeing that he was unsuccessful in these directions, Mr. Gandhi—or his lieutenants I am bound to say more than he—have turned from the educated classes and tried to secure success for their movement by creating unrest among the masses; and therein lie great potentialities of danger and

mischievous. We have at present much economic unrest prevalent, much political unrest, partly local, partly caused by world-wide causes, and these it is possible for any evil-minded man now to use for evil purposes. It is easy to rouse ill-feelings and passions at a juncture like the present and that, I fear, is the course which many of these non-co-operators are pursuing.

Now, in such a situation, there were three policies open to the Government. We could have gone in for a general policy of repression, but we are very unwilling to adopt this course, though we have been pressed to undertake it by a certain section of opinion. Such a policy leads nowhere: it is not consistent with the spirit of the Reforms; it would have served merely to increase bitterness and racial feeling; it would have impeded the social and political progress of this country; it is inconsistent with the greater liberty of speech and action which these Reformed councils would demand from the government; it would have necessarily involved an invasion of private rights which are highly cherished by all the people; it would have alienated support from Government, would have strengthened the very people we wanted to weaken and would, I believe, materially have weakened the moderate party and precipitated disorder. Those are the reasons why we did not take that line. It might have been possible to suppress this thing at an early stage with comparatively little bloodshed, but, even if it had been done, I maintain that the effect would not have been lasting, and I do not believe any Government relying on repression alone could have lasted for more than say, three or five years.

Now, I say this in answer to the charges that have been brought against Government outside this Chamber, and I am afraid outside this country, that we have acted unwisely in not using every weapon in our armoury, including such emergency measures as the Defence of India Act and Regulation III of 1818 to intern anybody who said or did anything to support this movement, and I have tried to explain to this Assembly—and I hope I shall have the support of Honourable Members in this matter—the reasons why the Government did not adopt that policy—a policy which is also not consistent with the trend of Modern European opinion. There is another reason why we are averse to a campaign of general repression. We know that men's minds are profoundly disturbed, partly by religious and partly by political causes; and in such circumstances, it is better for Government to bear with discontents, to do what they can to remove them, and exercise the greatest patience and tolerance in dealing with men whose minds have been tried very sorely in various ways.

The second course would have been to come forward and concede in full the extremists' demands. Well, I pointed out

recently that I believe that such a course is not consistent with our duty towards His Majesty's Government. It would, I believe, and I have always said so, connote the withdrawal of the protection which is afforded to this country by its inclusion in the British Empire. That is a position that is in my opinion unassailable. Further, I believe that any abandonment of our responsibilities in this country at this juncture would immediately lead to anarchy and chaos; indeed, there are so many moral and material objections to such a course that it would be impossible to particularise them in the time available. No one, I think, can visualise the destruction of sixty years' work since this country came under the direct control of the Crown without a pang of sorrow. Great Britain has undertaken a great trust in this country, and, relying on that, capital has been invested; Indians and Europeans alike have dwelt in security; are all vested interests, all law and order, and all prosperity to be sacrificed to the demands of a party which, so far as I am aware, is destitute of all constructive policy? This is a policy which it would be impossible to defend, and it would be a breach of trust of the grossest kind incompatible with our duty to His Majesty's Government, incompatible with the Statute by virtue of which we administer this country, and incompatible with our duty to India itself. Further, I do not think it is what the best elements of the people of this country for a moment desire. Sir, the third possible course was to take up the line that we have taken; that is, to prosecute those guilty of disorder or incitements likely to lead to disorder and at the same time where there are grievances among the people, agrarian grievances, labour grievances, or anything else, to do our best to see that they are remedied; where legitimate demands are made upon us by this Assembly to remove political grievances, we are also doing our best to meet them; and it was in response to a demand of this kind that we appointed a committee recently on repressive legislation; and the same motive of course prompted me in the action I took regarding the Press Act. Indeed, throughout this session the Government of India has always been guided by a desire to meet this Assembly as far as possible, to do what they can to accede to its wishes, and to invite its support when they thought they were entitled to do so. That is the spirit in which I have attempted, speaking on behalf of Government to approach this object; and I am glad to take this opportunity of saying that I have received the greatest consideration from this Assembly throughout this session, consideration for which I cannot express myself too gratefully to Members of this Assembly now and here.

I do not deny that the position before Government is one that causes very grave anxiety. I do not want to exaggerate the dangers, but it would be equally unwise to minimise them.

We have these powerful forces working on masses of uneducated people, exercising in the case of Mr. Gandhi an influence which is of an extraordinary character. We have this inflammable material and unrest already caused by these economic causes. In such conditions I cannot say, and no man can say, when or where it will result in disorder or to what extent. But on this I am clear, there is one thing we must do, that is, to suppress disorder where it does occur and to prevent it when possible by punishing those who incite others to violence; and it is on this point that I seek the support of this Assembly. There is a dangerous spirit of lawlessness abroad; you have only to read what happens in various parts of the country to see this for yourselves. Honourable Members must have read for instance of the account of what happened in Rai Bareilly the other day. Here is the official account:

“Political agitators exploiting the legitimate grievances of the tenantry have worked them up to attempts to take the law into their own hands. The criminal classes have seized the opportunity and commenced looting; it has been necessary to fire, and there has been regrettable loss of life. Of the extent of the lawlessness there can be no question whatever: nor can there be any question that the agitators attempted to give political objective to the disorder. It was preached that the British Raj was coming to an end. Mr. Gandhi's name was brought in on every occasion; and one Maulvi was induced to declare that he would be King of Salona on the advent of the Gandhi-Raj.”

That, Sir, is the spirit in which these people work. The mobs are, of course, incited to these forms of disorder largely by professional agitators. If we are to prevent serious outbreaks of violence in various parts of the country, it is essential that we should be allowed to proceed at least under the ordinary law of the land against those who are guilty of misconduct in promoting such acts of lawlessness.

I heard a great deal of talk about repressive measures from some Honourable Members, but I heard very few instances cited of the use of any measures other than those which we are entitled to use under the ordinary law of the land. The Government prosecuted evil-doers wherever it could, although it is very difficult to prosecute in many cases owing to the unwillingness of witnesses to give evidence and to intimidation. Further lengthy prosecutions must involve delay and in themselves are an advertisement and cause unrest and excitement. The Government of India have always advocated prosecutions under the ordinary law of the land rather than any executive action in the form of internments and the like. Our policy is now challenged by the Honour-

able Member on the ground that it is unduly harsh and oppressive. May I read to the Assembly the last instructions that we have given to Local Governments? I cannot read the whole letter because there is necessarily confidential informations in it. I will read a portion:

"For the present therefore the Government of India would prefer to rely on measures such as:

- (1) Keeping the closest possible watch on attempts by the non-co-operators to spread disaffection among the rural masses and the labouring classes in the big towns or industrial centres;
- (2) The initiation and early enactment of remedial legislation wherever, as in the matter of Tenancy Law in some provinces, such legislation is required;
- (3) Counter propaganda, as for example, by giving the widest possible publicity to the intention of the Government to introduce remedial measures;
- (4) The vigorous prosecution under the ordinary law of all persons who are guilty of making seditious speeches and of inciting to violence and against whom evidence is available.

The Government of India have already urged this measure to which they attached the utmost importance on Local Governments, and they must again express their regret that so far such prosecutions have been instituted only in a small number of cases. The Government of India have refrained, for reasons that have been fully explained to Local Governments, from prosecuting the leaders on the general charge of advocating non-co-operation."

If I may pause here for a minute I may say there has been, so far as I am aware, no prosecution at all of any man merely for advocating or joining in this principle of non-violent non-co-operation. We have left such men alone, rightly or wrongly.....

"But they must again impress on Local Governments that this fact constitutes no reason for refraining from prosecuting others.

- (5) The enforcement in general of respect for the law. Cases have come to the notice of the Government of India in which large crowds have been allowed to indulge with impunity in demonstrations of an obviously unlawful character. Incidents of this kind cannot but tend to weaken the respect for law and order amongst the masses of the people."

We then go on to recommend prosecutions in such cases under Section 143 of the Indian Penal Code. The date of the letter is the 28th January, 1921.

Now, I appeal to members of this Assembly to say whether there is anything in that letter for which Govern-

ment can be held to blame as adopting repressive measures, and I make this appeal with confidence. It is quite true that Mr. Gandhi himself is an idealist and a visionary, and he does advocate—I hope he does so genuinely—abstention from all violence, and I repeat here that no man who advocates peaceful non-co-operation, that is to say, who merely abstains from co-operating with government or who does not use any violent means, has ever been prosecuted. Can any Honourable Member say, however, that the co-adjutors and lieutenants of Mr. Gandhi act on the same peaceful principles, whether they are actuated even by the same motives? Has that ever been seriously believed by any non-official who has been in contact with some of Mr. Gandhi's lieutenants recently? Let us take the case of two prominent Muhammadans who identify themselves with the case of Mr. Gandhi. Has it not been freely bruited abroad, rightly or wrongly, that they conceive the idea of a Musalman Empire in this country? Has it not even been said that they intend to effect this with the aid of foreign enemies? Has it not even been said that they contemplate an invasion of this country by a Foreign Power within a couple of months, which invasion Muhammadans inside this country are to aid? If there is nothing in all these rumours, why was then this anxiety recently to prevent friendly negotiations being arranged between the Amir of Afghanistan and the British Government? Was it not rather a curious attitude to take up? Are there not again among the non-co-operation party other persons with a distinct tendency to Bolshevism and others who secretly and indeed often overtly encourage and incite the masses to violence and disorder? Are not calumny—extending even to men whose names have long been honoured by Indians in this country—intimidation and social boycott, the weapons to which adherents to this movement have not scrupled to resort? Are there not men among them who openly say that they are endeavouring to seduce our soldiers and police from their duty and allegiance? Are there not those who deliberately promote such discord between employer and employee and between landlords and tenants as can only end in serious disorder? And in such circumstances, is it not essential that the government should be allowed to take such action as is necessary to preserve the public tranquillity? Is disorder to be allowed to spread until it is impossible to check it? Are we to stand aside and allow these incitements to disorder to continue and the disorder itself to go on unchecked merely because we are accused of using repressive measures? These are questions which members of this Assembly have to answer, bearing in mind their responsibilities as representatives of the people of India, and I maintain that it is essential that the Government should retain and exercise these powers, that the instructions which I have read out to this Assembly now are perfectly fair, and

there is nothing in them that any loyal or reasonable citizen can quarrel with.

Now let us proceed to consider the manner in which these principles have been applied. It is true that there have been more prosecutions lately than before. What is the reason? The reasons have been simply this, that the forces of disorder have gained strength and we have found it necessary to do what we can to counteract them. I read just now to the Assembly what happened at Rai Bareilly. We have had much the same thing in Bihar—hat-loreing. We have had the same sort of disorder in other provinces—deliberate attempts made by men, often in a religious garb, to promote and incite the masses to disorder, leading unfortunate ignorant people to commit violent crime. Every one at this moment knows again the dangerous state of affairs in the Punjab. Dr. Nandalal himself quite frankly admitted it, and every one is aware of the critical state of affairs created by Sikh unrest in that province.

Let us now see how far the action of the Local Governments were challenged in the places where we might expect it to be challenged, that is, in the local councils. I will take the case of the United Provinces, first of all. There was a debate in the United Provinces Council about the measures taken to suppress disorders at Rai Bareilly and if there had been any unduly drastic action, is it not certain that the local council would at once have censured the Government for their action? The fact that the members of the United Provinces Council did not regard the action of the Local Government as unfair and repressive is conclusively proved by the result of that debate in which the critics of Government were positively flattened out. They could not secure any support from the United Provinces Council, and the action of Government was not only defended, but successfully defended and approved by the Council.

Now let me take the case of Madras where action was taken against a gentleman of the name of Yakub Hasan. I believe, he has a Turkish wife. He was prosecuted under the ordinary law of the land and the action of the local authorities was discussed in the local council. There are a number of lawyers in the Madras Council, and I believe a fair number of Madrassee Brahmins—and they would never let unduly harsh measures to go unchallenged. The debate on the occasion was on a motion for adjournment and so no actual question was put to the House, but I am assured that the whole trend of the debate was on the side of the Government. Further, Honourable Members, who know the truth about this gentleman and the danger of allowing the excitement of the Moplah country will, I think, bear me out in the view that the Madras Government was entirely justified in its action.

Let us take the case of Bihar. The non-co-operation movement has been actively promoted there recently, and some members of the local council took exception to the policy of government in suppressing certain illegal activity and moved a resolution on the subject in the local council. This was not pressed to a division but was withdrawn. Now we know perfectly well what that means. It means that the Council was satisfied that there was really no cause for complaint. Of course there are sometimes other reasons for withdrawing a resolution, but ordinarily when a Resolution is debated and withdrawn the reasonable inference is that which I have stated. Similarly in the Punjab, I believe, I am right in saying that they had a debate on the question of the application of the Seditious Meetings Act. I think Raja Narendra Nath put up the motion. What happened there? Nothing. I think the resolution was either withdrawn or rejected. Now what do all these things show? They show that in the opinion of the local councils the application of the principles which I have advocated has been justified. I have read out the principles to this Assembly and I believe they will accept them too. And may I refer here again to Delhi where action has been taken to suppress certain assemblies and prosecute evil-doers for persistent intimidation and shameful acts of violence; where not only the living but even the dead are not spared from insult and indignities, are we not justified in taking action? The conduct is typical of the terrorism and intimidation that is practised in certain parts of Northern India, and I am sure this Assembly will support the action of Government in prosecuting evil-doers in such cases and in taking measures to suppress illegal associations created to intimidate peaceful citizens and promote sedition and disorder.

I have now explained what the position is and what our policy is. We are prepared to go as far as we can to meet legitimate demands, to strengthen moderate opinion in this country, to make the Reforms a reality, to make these legislative bodies great bodies in the Reformed Government, to remove genuine grievances wherever they occur, to go out of our way even at a sacrifice of efficiency as far as we can to meet demands of educated opinion; at the same time where we have proof of incitements to disorders, either direct or indirect, to punish the offenders.

I want to ask if this Assembly, which has accepted its share in grave responsibility *vis à vis* the government, so well throughout this session, will not support us in this policy also?

Mr. Eardley Norton : Sir, may I ask the Hon'ble gentleman before he sits down, whether there is any truth in the allegation made here to-day that men have been prosecuted for merely preaching temperance?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Certainly not, and I can at once prove this, if I may read the telegram I have here. There is a prosecution connected with excise sale in the Central Provinces and for that reason I did not like to refer to it. But I can assure the Honourable Member that the Government have never either now or in the past years taken any action against anyone who simply advocated the cause of temperance. It was only when there was deliberate intimidation used that persons have been prosecuted. As the matter is *sub-judice*, I hope I am not committing contempt of court if I read the telegram.

The Honourable The President : If the case is *sub-judice* you had better not read it.

Khan Bahadur Zahir-Ud-Din Ahmed : Sir, I oppose the Resolution. In my opinion, the Government instead of adopting repressive measures is showing great forbearance which in some quarters is being interpreted as weakness. On the above grounds, I am against the Resolution.

Government is bound to uphold the peace and order of the country.* If the Government does not do it, it fails in its main duty. If some people are determined to upset the tranquillity of the country, they are not the friends of the peaceful citizens of the Empire but are their enemies, and as such they are to be taken in hand by the Government. To countenance them means doing us, the peaceful people, a great wrong.

The mover said that the non-co-operation is non-violent. I have seen a good deal of non-co-operation, but I must admit they were not at all non-violent. Whatever the non-co-operators may say, I am convinced, they are determined to have a great revolution. They want Swaraj without British connection which means quite a different thing from Home Rule. I may submit here, that Swaraj without British connection cannot be secured without a successful rebellion. The people I represent do not want rebellion. Suppose we rebel, there is very little chance of success. If we succeed, we go back half a century. There will be so much loss of life that even 50 years will not make it up. Suppose we fail, we get a century behind. In both accounts such alternatives are to be avoided. Even if the British leave us of their own accord to-day, we shall have to call them back to-morrow. For without the British, there will be chaos and anarchy in the country. Musalmans will be fighting with the Hindus, Sikhs with Pathans—Afghans, Nepalese and Japanese will all be on us, and our position will be the worst on the face of the earth.

Mr. Gandhi was in Dacca recently. He was talking to a Musalman, a friend of mine there, that Swaraj is life and death to us. My Musalman friend replied—"yes, life for you and death for us." I am for peace and order, hence I

am against non-co-operation as by non-co-operation the peace and order of the country will be upset.

We are going to get Home Rule sooner or later if we know how to behave well. I cannot understand why we should court trouble for a thing which we can get in the usual way when the time must come, just as a ripe fruit falls to the ground. Let us have commonsense and separate ourselves from the non-co-operators and let us say good-bye to them for all time.

Personally, I love my religion greatly, but I love peace and order in the country still more.....

Government is not doing enough for our protection. I have seen so much trouble created by these non-co-operators in my own country that I am sick of them and more sick of Government for giving them a free hand.

Sardar Bahadur Gajjan Singh : Sir, I rise to oppose the Resolution. In my opinion, Government up to this time has been following a policy which it is my painful duty to point out, is unwise. No Government worthy of the name could hear for a number of months speeches openly made to the effect that this Government is to be overthrown, this Government is to be turned out of India, money is to be collected, an army is to be raised, if there is an invasion from outside this Government is not to be assisted.

I am strongly in favour of patience and for forbearance, but there must be some limit to that. I venture to point out, that measures sufficient to cope with the situation should have long ago been undertaken. Government, I am sorry to say, have neglected their duties towards their loyal subjects and the law-abiding people. No Government on earth could possibly have allowed such a propaganda without a word of protest. I tell you, Sir, from my own experience, that the subordinate Government officials are simply showing weakness in the matter; because they think that there will be no support given to them by the Central Government. I hope I may not be misunderstood. I am not for repressive measures. I am for the progress and development of my country. But I am strongly in favour of maintaining law and order. It is impossible to assert that this movement of non-co-operation can be carried out without any violence. We know what has happened in Calcutta. The boys would not allow other students to go into the examination hall. They would not allow the examiners to enter the hall. Mr. Sastri and Pandit Malaviya were assaulted. Such instances can be multiplied.

Then, what effect this propaganda have upon the uneducated people, upon the masses, upon the villagers? They simply construe that into weakness of Government. They will be of opinion that Government have made up their minds to leave them to themselves, and that they are entirely at the

mercy of these persons. Open seditious meetings and lectures are given which no government on the face of the earth can possibly tolerate. For a time it appeared as though all those sections of the Indian Penal Code which deal with such offences had been repealed. There is absolutely no reason why Government should not handle the situation boldly, legally and constitutionally. There was one difficulty of which people were very much afraid of. When any necessity arises the rude element of the country take advantage of the country. They commit robberies, dacoities, and other serious offences against the law of the land, and when those offences are being investigated, innocent people are hauled up. Of course, nobody can blame the Government for that. Government never wanted any innocent persons to be hauled up or to suffer. There is absolutely no doubt that Government are in possession of many facts in connection with this movement, but I very much doubt if they fully realise the whole situation. They are well informed on each and every detail. It is all very well to say, that all these measures of repression ought to be a matter of the past. But it is for us to show that there is absolutely no necessity for the Government to take any repressive measures, and I very much doubt whether the actual bringing to justice of legal offenders is really a repressive measure. I am strongly against Government taking any action which will crush the spirit of the people, at least the political spirit. But I would boldly and strongly advise Government that lawlessness and commission of offences should be boldly faced and put an end to in the interests of law and the law-abiding people of the country. As long as this movement was confined to educated people who can think for themselves and who can come to correct decisions, nobody need be anxious about it. But, as we know, it is now proposed that the movement is to be taken from home to home, from village to village, and from city to city. Then it should be very unwise on the part of the Government of India to initiate a policy which would lend colour to the view that Government themselves encourage these people and embolden them, and do not do anything. So, I think Government has done only the right thing in initiating the new policy, and I strongly urge upon them that they should never allow such sort of propaganda work. I do not know whether non-cooperation itself is very serious or not—but what have the actual speeches effected? How are the minds of the people being poisoned? No government worth its salt can tolerate such a thing. Such things should be stopped. They are offences against the law of the land and I regret to say that for several months past the law had not been brought into force. I, therefore, submit, that while I am very strongly against any repressive measures and in favour of the progress of the country on very liberal lines, Government should not

forget their duties and should enforce what is necessary according to law, to preserve peace and order at any rate.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraj Hussain Khan: Sir, I have given notice of an amendment to the Resolution, and that is this "That the words 'as far as possible' be inserted after the word 'adherence' and the sentence beginning with 'and' and ending in 'India' be omitted."

What I meant was, that there are always new conditions and new developments arising; and if the Government find themselves under the necessity of doing something new, we should in no way tie their hands. Secondly, my object was, that when the Local Governments are already doing their work satisfactorily so far as this non-co-operation is concerned, we should not tie their hands or embarrass them. This is the object of my amendment. But after hearing the Honourable the Home Member and my friend Sardar Gajjan Singh, I wish to endorse every word that has fallen from them.

It is, I think, the clear duty of Government to protect all law-abiding people. It was evident from the very beginning that Government showed want of firmness so far as they allowed this propaganda to stand. Government have failed to understand not only its violent character, but have allowed it to go on for a long time, and it will now take double the labour to check it. As is now the case, non-violent preaching is becoming violent and I have seen people rushing in and interrupting speakers at meetings. There was a meeting in Mr. Hasan Iman's house at Patna. Some boys and some elderly men too, uninvited, rushed in and sat and wanted to speak. When they were told, that they had no right to speak, then, in a body, they retired. It is the duty of Government to check these things and to help the law-abiding people. It is, I again say, the clear duty of Government to help the people when molested. The Honourable the Home Member is sitting here and I am addressing him and I tell him that plainly. I need not dilate on the matter any further. I do not wish to be irrelevant or talk nonsense, but I am firmly of opinion that the measures that are being taken should in no case be stopped. As a member coming from Behar, I have personal experience of the whole matter, and as a Congressman, I know Mr. Gandhi and know the motives of non-co-operators. I do not wish to detain the house any longer. My friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, will say what his fate was when he tried to speak at the Congress held in Calcutta. Let the Government have a free hand in the matter. Besides we are going to hold a sub-committee, and all these things will come up before it. With these words, I strongly oppose the motion.

* * * * *

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: May I move an amendment to that, Sir? I wish to propose this amendment. I

would omit the last clause, as my friend, Khan Bahadur Safaraj Hussain, suggests,—“and ask the” to the ends and substitute this instead:

“and prevent the adoption by Local Governments of measures other than under the ordinary law of the land except under emergency and when extraordinary measures are to be resorted to, this should be undertaken only with the concurrence of the respective Ministers and the Government of India.”

* * * * *

Sir, this is an occasion when every responsible citizen has to give expression to his sound views without fear or favour, without fear, either of Government or of the public, because both are potent factors influencing the judgment of man.... .The non-co-operators found a fertile field for operations. Unfortunately the history of the last two or three years has not been creditable. Now, the Honourable the Home Member asked us for sound advice in this matter, and I appeal to him to look at the pages of the History of the measures adopted by Government from 1910 onwards and see what has been the result of the measures adopted during those ten years. The lessons are writ large during the period of the last ten years. Sir, when I read the debates in this council a year before, I think over the Punjab affairs, I formed a very bad opinion of the Honourable the Home Member, whom I had not set eyes upon; and, therefore, Sir, when I came to this Assembly I came with rage and anger and I was ready to pounce upon him if occasion arose. But Sir, he has disarmed me in this respect. Not only he, but the other members of the Government, have also disarmed me in this matter. What is the cause of this change? What is the cause for the change in the attitude adopted by us? It is all because Government as now administered and advised are pursuing a very sound policy indeed. Their readiness to be frank and full in the statement of their case, their readiness to comply with legitimate demands made by the peoples' representatives in this Hall—all appeal to us. Are these the men, was the question put by myself to myself, are these the men who treated Madan Mohan Malaviya with that contempt which we see in the debates? I was surprised to see the change that had come upon them, and I hold that this is due in large measure to three causes: First of all the presence of my Indian friends in the inner counsel of Government; secondly, the attitude of His Gracious Majesty the King-Emperor, and thirdly, Sir, the great event which we witnessed last month by which His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught came here to inaugurate the various Assemblies. I welcome the change. I welcome the change for more reasons than one. The non-co-operator had a fertile field to sow his seed upon, but, Sir, the seed was a rotten seed;

the soil was fertile enough, but the seed was not one which can appeal to the intellect, to the sane intellect of my countrymen. My countrymen may be given credit for shrewdness; they are not fools, they are not likely to be led easily as the Honourable the Home Member supposes. No doubt, now and then there will be ebullitions here and there, but, Sir, such ebullitions can be put an end to by the ordinary weapons which the Government have in their hands; and I am glad Government's policy has been to resort only to the ordinary law of the land. Repressive measures other than those under the ordinary law will never pay, have not paid at any time. Has not the history of last ten years taught us that the more you resort to repressive measures out of the ordinary law the deeper the discontent, the deeper the disloyalty which you create in the minds of the people? Therefore, Sir, I welcome the announcement of the policy made in November last. I welcome again the announcement which has been read just now by the Honourable the Home Member from that confidential despatch which he referred to of January. By all means use the ordinary law of the land. It is because the ordinary law of the land was not sufficiently used that the situation which you now find it difficult to eradicate arose in the last seven or ten years. By all means use them. No responsible citizen, no sane man, will object to the ordinary law of the land being used; therefore I move my amendment, namely, that while welcoming the declaration of policy as contained in the announcement in November and October last, I think the Government ought to take care that local Governments do not resort to other than the ordinary law of the land except with the consent of the Ministers of the Provinces concerned and with the concurrence of the Government of India..... But we responsible citizens who have come here to assist the Government ought to assist the Government in maintaining law and order. Who can say nay to it? But in maintaining law and order, whether the agents of Government practise law and order is what we have to see. Government, just as they are swift enough to come down upon citizens, should also be equally swift to come down upon their agents who break the law and order. It is because they do not do this, that even people who are constitutionally conservative are perforce obliged to distrust the Government. Now, all those days are past, and I hope they are passed for ever, and I hope Government will be strong not only in dealing with the agitator and the people, but also with their agents who have to carry on the trust that is entrusted to them by their being placed in a position to look after the welfare of the millions of this country.....

* * * *

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraj Hussain Khan: If it is the wish of the House, I shall withdraw my amendment.

(The amendment was, by the leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.) * * * *

Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyer: Sir, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have fallen from my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, in moving this amendment. Those who have heard the statement of the Honourable the Home Member must feel it their duty to support the Government in their attempts to preserve law and order by recourse to such measures as the ordinary law provides them with. The statement of the policy which was made by the Home Member must commend itself to all of us. The Government say they have only two objects: one to make the Reforms a real success and promote the attainment of full responsible government; and the other, the preservation of peace and order. No one of us can possibly take exception to that statement of the policy of the Government of India, and as regards the measures to be adopted by them, I am in entire concurrence with the course which has been advocated by my friend, Mr. Rangachariar. * * * *

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas: "They came to curse! and went home blessing." I think that proverb in a great measure applies to the debate that we have listened to to-day. Now, Sir, you are aware that the chief plank in the non-co-operation platform was the boycott of the councils, and therefore you can at once conclude that all those who have assembled here to-day are against non-co-operation. Sir, I wanted, in order to bring this motion before this Assembly, as I have explained, in the first place to have a declaration of policy, and in the second place to impress upon the Government that this was not the opportune time for the adoption of repressive measures as we had originally understood them. But here I might say, that after hearing the Honourable the Home Member, if his statements are to be believed, and I do not see any reason why they should not be believed, really no such measures as are implied in this Resolution are being adopted. As the Honourable the Home Member has explained to us, it is only the ordinary law of the land that is being resorted to and that also where disorder arises, where the peace and tranquillity of the country is threatened, and where the law-abiding people have otherwise to suffer. Under these circumstances, I do not think there is any man, who has lost all sense of order and peace, will question the action of the Government.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru: Sir, after the very lucid and exhaustive speech of my Honourable colleague Sir William Vincent, I do not think I should be justified in taking the time of the House unnecessarily in explaining the policy of the Government. So far as that policy is concerned, if I may be permitted to sum it up, it can be summed

up in one word. The mere fact that a person happens to belong to the non-co-operation movement, or that he is carrying on non-co-operation propaganda, is not enough to bring him within the purview of the law. But when he transgresses a certain limit, when he appeals to popular passion and incites people to violence, he cannot under any system of law or political morality claim exemption for himself. That was the keynote of the Resolution which was issued by the Government in November last, and I venture to think that if you examine dispassionately each single case that has arisen since November last, you will find that the Government has scrupulously adhered to that principle. It is possible, that whenever any prosecution had been started, either under one section or under another section of the Penal Code, you may hold that the conviction was wrong, but that is not the question before the house. The question is, whether in regard to any important matter which is to be found in that Resolution the Government had made a departure. On that point, Sir William Vincent has given what is, I venture to submit, an effective answer, and I hope that the House will accept it. Now, with regard to the amendment which has been moved this afternoon by Mr. Rangachariar, I am sure, it has been moved in a spirit of friendliness, and I believe that nothing is further from the intention of my friend than that his amendment should have the effect of embarrassing the Government

If you analyse the terms of this Resolution, and I will beg **you to analyse them** rather closely because that will prevent you from going astray, if I may be permitted to say so, it really comes to this: in the first place the Government of India are asked to declare that they are adhering to the policy enunciated by them in October and November last, and in the second place, it asks the Government of India to request the local governments or to ask the local governments to stop all repressive measures without exception which are now being used all over India.....

I believe what was passing in the mind of Mr. Jatkar when he framed this resolution, and what I must assume was also in the mind of Dr. Nanda Lal when he stood god-father to it, was the prosecutions which are being started under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code in various parts of the country. Now, here, I will beg you to remember that you have passed a resolution in this Assembly asking this Government to appoint a committee for the consideration of all repressive legislation, and I would respectfully remind the House that among the various Acts or Laws that you have referred to, certainly section 144 is not one.....

Now I come to the amendment which has been moved by Mr. Rangachariar. His objection is not to the application of the ordinary law of the land whenever it may be necessary,

but his objection is that the application of the ordinary law should be subject to two important conditions.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: No, no, you have misunderstood me. Extraordinary law I said.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru: I thought my learned friend looked upon section 144.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Certainly not. Section 144 has been the law of the land for ever so long.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru: So far as my argument is concerned, it remains unaffected by that distinction which has been pointed out to me. Take, for instance, the extraordinary law of the land. I will only venture to point out to the House, that there are certain special Acts passed by the Legislature which can be extended to the provinces only with the previous sanction of the Government of India. So that my learned friend need have no apprehensions with regard to the particular matter. Again, it is quite obvious that if the terms of the amendment are accepted in the manner in which it has been moved, I venture to submit, it really casts a reflection upon the local Governments.

I will now briefly deal with the second part of the amendment, and that is that which related to consultation with Ministers. I shall venture to point out that Law and Justice in the provinces are Reserved Subjects, and constitutionally it would be absolutely wrong to impose the condition that no action should be taken under any extraordinary act by the Governor in Council unless he had the consent of the Ministers who had nothing to do with Law and Justice. In actual practice, you will find in certain provinces, that the Ministers are generally consulted by the Governor.

Therefore, I ask you on these grounds not to accept the amendment which has been moved by Mr. Rangachariar. I have only one word more to say and then I shall resume my seat. Probably, it has been assumed in the course of discussion that most of the prosecutions that have been started have been started light-heartedly. The best answer that I can give is, in the words of Mr. Gandhi himself which I came across in his own paper this morning. Honourable Members may no doubt be aware that a distinguished member of the Legislative Council, I refer to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, has the misfortune of differing from Mr. Gandhi in regard to the non-co-operation movement. I need not remind the House of the recent happenings at Benares, but it is sufficient for me to say, that a man of his personality deserves certainly better treatment, and yet the treatment he has received you will gather from the paragraph that I am going to read to you. I will give the view which Mr. Gandhi himself has taken of the Benares prosecutions in his "Young India." These are the words used:

"The attack on Pandit Malaviya is symptomatic of the temper of the people. If any man in India should be free from insult it is Panditji. His services to the Punjab are still fresh in our memory. After all, his labour alone has brought into being that Great University in Benares. His patriotism is second to no one's. He is gentle to a fault. It is India's misfortune, not his fault that he does not see his way clear to risk the temporary giving up of his idol (that is, the Benares University). That he should have been insulted in the manner reported is a matter of deep sorrow. If the Sanskrit students or the so-called *Sanvashis* chose to block the passage of the students, Panditji certainly had the right—it was his duty—to intervene and secure a free passage for co-operating students. In my opinion, the police were perfectly justified in prosecuting the ring-leaders or those whom they believed to be such. That those arrested were roughly handled I can well believe. But we may not expect gentleness from the police even when we have attained Swaraj. I am, therefore, unable to extend any sympathy to those who so manifestly discredited a cause which they ignorantly claimed to represent."

When intolerance of this character spreads over the land, can you really expect the people to behave otherwise than these people did, and can you expect any other judgment than that which has been given by Mr. Gandhi himself? The whole point to my mind is this. I say to those who are responsible for the movement, "you have sown the wind, and you cannot refuse to reap the whirlwind."

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : My Honourable friend Dr. Sapru, has anticipated me in quoting the passage from "Young India" but there is one sentence particularly in that paragraph written by Mr. Gandhi which he would apply to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, and which, with due deference it would apply to Mr. Gandhi himself. He says, speaking about the beloved Panditji—

"It is India's misfortune and not his fault that he should not give up his temporary idol and not join the non-co-operation movement."

I should say the same thing about Mr. Gandhi—

"It is India's misfortune and not his fault that he should not give up his idol of non-co-operation and join this movement of making the Reforms a success."

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Resolution moved by my friend Dr. Nanda Lal. It has been pointed out, and

I entirely agree, that it would not be right for us as responsible members of this Assembly to tie down the hands of Government to a policy which it may be necessary for them to change any day in view of the circumstances that are to-day existing in the country. One does not know what developments will take place in the movement of non-co-operation. We see clear signs of outbursts of violence here and there. It may not be at certain places in a very acute form, but there are clear indications that the spirit of intolerance is growing far and wide among those who call themselves non-co-operationists, and for the purpose of preserving law and order and giving peace to the people of this country, it may be necessary for the Government to resort to the law of the land in order to deal with those who are inciting the people to crime.

Mr. Gandhi himself has justified the action of the police against those who treated Pandit Malaviya in that manner. This morning I was reading in the "Leader" a letter written by a gentleman called Krishnaji of Allahabad, and in that letter I read a piece of news which made me very angry. Last year, or the year before last, when I heard of the treatment accorded to the revered Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya in the Council by the government officials, I confess I could not help feeling angry with those who had thus insulted a man who stands as an example of self-sacrifice and love of country in India. But I assure you, Sir, that when I read this morning of the insult that had been hurled at Pandit Malaviya by those who pose as leaders of the country to-day and who have succeeded in driving out of the Indian National Congress leader after leader to the detriment of the cause that is dear to us all, that insults have been hurled by those which go far beyond the insults that even in imagination the officials could not have ever hurled at Pandit Malaviya, my anger against officials entirely disappeared. This is what one of the leaders of the non-co-operation movement says about Pandit Malaviya. He said at a public meeting that he wished that Pandit Malaviya had been dead rather than that he should not join this movement. I ask you, Sir, whether these so-called non-co-operators and their leaders have not transgressed all the limits of propriety in trying to make their movement successful. It is likely that they may escape the result, the penalty, for these crimes as I may call them, but those whom they incite to crime will, I think, not be able to escape being victims of the action of those who incite them. Sir, if in this country, any one had ventured to insult a man of the type of Pandit Malaviya in the presence of some of us who hold him as an example of patriotism as self-sacrifice for the country, I think it would not have been possible for some of us to keep in our minds the principle of AHIMSA which Mr. Gandhi is in season and out of season,

preaching. We would probably have taken the law into our own hands and justifiably so; and, at this moment in the country, when insults are being hurled at those who have grown grey in the service of the motherland in this manner; when, under the guise of staunch nationalism and patriotism, men with questionable aims come out and create a following in the country, then, I think, it becomes the duty not only of the Government but of all who consider themselves peaceful and law-abiding citizens to come out and join hands and say emphatically that this movement shall be put down. Sir, the Honourable the Home Member has told us that no person is going to be prosecuted only because he belongs to the non-co-operation movement and this is, I think, a very great safeguard that is provided against resort to repression. The Honourable the Home Member has also informed us that some of those who call themselves followers of Mr. Gandhi, far from sharing the high ideals of Mr. Gandhi and his views about non-violence, are known to be carrying on negotiations with foreigners with a view to make it possible that a foreign aggression should come to this country. I say Sir, that if this is the state of affairs, then it is high time, that instead of being afraid of unpopularity, instead of facing the situation as it stands to-day, we should refuse to allow ourselves to be carried away by a sense of false fear of the people, and refuse to act against their interests by according to a Resolution like one that Dr. Nanda Lal has moved: Sir, I assure you that there is not a single member of this Assembly, who, in whatever he does in this Assembly and outside it, is not stirred with a feeling of patriotism and staunch nationalism. I am sure there is not one member of the Assembly who does not look upon the country as the sole object of his services and who would do anything that is against the interests of the country. I may say that there is no member of this Assembly whose sole object in coming to this Assembly is not to serve to the best of his ability the interests of his country. I am sure that there is no member of the Assembly who does not hold his country dearer than, I may say, life itself: and, if this is so, then I think it becomes the paramount duty of every member, when a situation of this character arises, to come forward, even at the risk of displeasing the people, and tell them, as Charles Bradlaugh told them in old times—and there was hardly a man who was more popular than Charles Bradlaugh:

“ I love you; I shall work for you; I live for you; I am prepared to die for you; but when you go wrong, I shall have the courage to say stop, you are wrong, you shall not do this.”

Sir, I oppose the Resolution.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, I want to say a word with reference to this amendment of Mr. Ranga-

chariar.....Well, the first point I want to make on this amendment is—does this Assembly wish to weaken the hands of the Local Governments? Because that will undoubtedly be the effect of accepting this amendment. The suggestion will be—“that local Governments have been issuing repressive measures improperly and we are preventing them.” I do not think that Mr. Rangachariar or any one else wants that impression to be created. Local Governments have been suffering from all this disorder and it is essential to check it. One accusation indeed brought against us, as said by Sardar Gajjan Singh, was that the Local Governments are unreasonably backward in prosecuting when they ought to; and a great many people take the view. If in such circumstances you are going to tell the Local Governments that they have been too hard and that we are going to prevent them from prosecuting hereafter without the concurrence of the Ministers, they will say— “well, here is the Government of India, here is the Legislative Assembly letting us down again; we have struggled hard against this movement; first you ask us to take certain action and then you will not support us.”..... However, I appreciate his difficulty and I suggest that we might, if it meets the members of this House, close the debate on these lines, and accept an amendment on the following words, which I have drafted I may say, in consultation with my friend, Sir Sivaswami Aiyer. It runs as follows:

“That the Government should adhere to its policy as announced to the Assembly to-day and as far as possible to avoid recourse to any proceedings under exceptional legislation in dealing with the non-co-operation movement; that is, they should prosecute under the ordinary law where they can, but should not have recourse to exceptional legislation save in exceptional circumstances.”

I believe that will meet everybody.....I have only two more points to make. I have just mentioned that there are some people who think that the Local Governments do not prosecute enough. Now, this is a very difficult question. I am myself all in favour of prosecuting more people under the ordinary law; but the difficulty is, that the witnesses will not come forward; they are intimidated and are therefore unwilling to give evidence, and prosecutions take a long time and create a good deal of excitement.....

The only other point to which I wish to refer is the allegation that I have changed my attitude since last year. I gather that the Honourable Member thinks that the change is for the better. The best reason I can give for this, if it is correct, is that I am a servant of His Majesty the King-

Emperor, and of His Majesty's Government, and it is our duty to make every effort to carry out the policy of His Majesty's Government to make these Reforms a success by co-operating with this Assembly. And it is the proud privilege of the Indian Civil Service to which I have the honour to belong, to join in the effort to make the Reformed Governments the most successful that this country has ever seen.

* * * * *

Dr. Nanda Lal: I may be permitted to offer some remarks, Sir. (Cries of 'No, No,' and 'Withdraw, Withdraw'). Those who are ready to ask me to withdraw, I am sorry, will feel disappointed.....

Sir, I think, not only I, but also every member of this Assembly, has to perform a duty, and that duty is characterised in a peculiar way. The terms of our service are, that we have to convey the message of the majority of the people of India to the Government, and at the same time we have got to assist the Government thereby. In that spirit this Resolution has been moved, so that the Government may be able to hear what the views of the majority of the people of India are; the Government will have an opportunity of giving an explanation and the people of India will hear what the Government has to say in the matter. Therefore, I entertain every hope that the Government will be pleased to hear the views of the people of this country. The Honourable Sir William Vincent has endeavoured to give an explanation. If I have rightly followed him, it is this, that there is the non-co-operation movement and it is creating numerous difficulties and that consequently Government is compelled to resort to repressive measures. In reply to that, I may venture to inform him that there are two schools of thought in India.

Non-co-operation is one school, the other school comprising gentlemen who are in favour of co-operation. So, therefore, I think his fears, with due deference to his experience, power of anticipation, foresight and insight, are a bit magnified. If the school, comprising gentlemen in favour of co-operation, do not, as I dare say they do not, share the view of their school, then, I believe, there is not much to fear

.....

The Honourable the President:.....The question I have to put—(to Mr. Rangachariar) I understand the Honourable Member withdraws his amendment?

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Subject to two words, Sir.

The Honourable The President: Order, order, I understand the Honourable Member does not desire to press his amendment. The question I have to put is, that leave be given to Mr. Rangachariar to withdraw his amendment.

(The amendment was, by leave of the Assembly,
withdrawn.)

The Honourable The President: The question is, that leave be given to Dr. Nanda Lal to withdraw his Resolution.

Dr. Nanda Lal: I have not withdrawn my Resolution, sir.

Mr. S. P. O'Donnel : Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

“That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that Government should adhere to its policy as announced to the Assembly to-day, and should as far as possible avoid recourse to any proceedings under exceptional legislation in dealing with the non-co-operation movement.”

* * * * *

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I move that the question be now put.

The Honourable the President: The question is, that the following Resolution be adopted:—

“That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that Government should adhere to its policy as announced to the Assembly to-day and should, as far as possible, avoid recourse to any proceedings under exceptional legislation in dealing with the non-co-operation movement.”

The Resolution was adopted.



